A VINDICATION OF THE AUTHORITY, CONSTITUTION, AND LAWS OF THE CHURCH AND STATE OF SCOTLAND.

IN FOUR CONFERENCES.

Wherein the Anſwer to the Dialogues betwixt the Conformiſt and the Non-conformiſt, is examined.

By GILBERT BURNET, Profeſſor of Theology in Glaſgow.

64 B



NATIONAL LIBRARY OF SCOTLAND

GLASGOW,
By ROBERT SANDERS, Printer to the City, and Univerſity.

M. DC. LXXIII.

that ſucceſs and bleſſings may attend Your endeavors, ſhal be prayed for more earneſtly by nom alive, then by,

May it pleaſe YOUR GRACE,

Your Graces moſt humble,
moſt faithful, and moſt
obliged ſervant,

G. BURNET

TO THE READER.

HOW ſad, but how full a Commentary doth the age we live in, give on theſe words of our Lord? *Luke* 12. 49. *I am come to ſend fire on the earth: ſuppoſe you that I am come to give peace on the earth; I tell you, nay; but rather diviſion: for from henceforth there ſhal be five in one houſe divided.* Do we not ſee the father divided againſt the ſon, and the ſon againſt the father, and engaging into ſuch angry heats and mortal feuds, upon colors of Religion, as if the ſeed of the Word of GOD, like *Cadmus* teeth, had ſpawned a generation of cruel and blood-thirſty men? But how ſurpriſing is the wonder, when Religion becomes the pretence, and ſeems to give the riſe to theſe animoſities, ſince the wiſdom and goodneſs of GOD hath deviſed nothing more proper and powerful for over-ruling all the ſecret paſſions of the mind,

and for mortifying of all boiſterous diſorders? The doctrine delivered by our meek and lowly Maſter, teacheth us the great leſſons of humility, of ſelf-diffidence, and ſelf-contempt, guards againſt the undervaluing of others, and the over-rating of our ſelves, gives check to wrath, anger, emulation and envy, hatred and malice, railing and cenſuring: And in a word, deſignes the moulding our natures into a conformity with its bleſſed Author; who when he was reviled, reviled not again; but practiſed without a blemiſh, thoſe great leſſons he taught his diſciples, of doing good for evil, loving his enemies, and praying for ſuch as deſpitefully uſed him. But how far have we fallen from that lovely Pattern? And how is the ſerene and peaceable viſage of Chriſtianity transformed into a ſowr cankered and ſurly temper, as if that which obliged us to love all men, ſhould engage us to look moroſe on all but a handful of a party: and that which ſhould dilate our love to all mankind, is given for a ground of contracting it to a few as ill natured as our ſelves?

Is there not a generation among us who highly value themſelves, & all of their own form; but whoſo differs from them, is ſure of their fierceſt ſpite, and bittereſt cenſures? Are the lives of ſuch as differ from them vertuous, then they ſay they are good moral men: But, alace! they know

know not what it is to be ſpiritual, Again, are they devout and grave, then they are called Monaſtick people, Juglers, or Papiſts. And if nothing can be faſtened on them, the charge of hypocriſie is the laſt ſhift of malice: Or if they have been guilty of any failings and miſtakes, they are ſo far from covering or diſguiſing of them; that on the contrary, the relating, the aggravating, and the commenting on theſe, is the main ſubject of all their diſcourſes. And if they go on a viſit, the firſt civilities are ſcarce over, when theſe Stories (true or falſe, all is to one purpoſe) come to make up their converſation. Who can have the leaſt tincture of the Chriſtian Spirit, and look on without ſad regrates, and ſee this bitter, fierce, and cruel venom poyſoning the ſeveral *Sects* and diviſions of Chriſtendom? The root and ſpring whereof is no other then a carnal, proud, and unmortified temper: for few are ſo Atheiſtical, but they deſire to paſs, both in their own account, and in the opinion of others, for good Chriſtians: but when they find how hard a thing it is to be a Chriſtian indeed, and that they muſt mortifie all their carnal appetits, their fierce paſſions, and ſwellings of pride, deſpiſe the world, and be reſigned in all things to the will of GOD, before they can deſerve that noble Character, then they purſue another method more grateful to their

corrupt

corrupt minds, which is to liſt themſelves under a party, to cheriſh and value the Heads and Leaders of it, and to divide their kindneſs to all of their ſtamp: they ſtifly adhere to the formes, and maintain all the humors and opinions of that party to which they have aſſociated themſelves, and they whet their ſpirits and ſharpen their tongues againſt all of another mould, which ſome do with an undiſguiſed fierceneſs: Others with a viſage of more gravity, by which they give the deeper wounds. What ſad effects flow from this ſpirit is too viſible; and I love not to play the Diviner, or to preſage all the miſchief it threatens: but certain it is that the great buſineſs of Religion lyes under an univerſal neglect, while every one looks more abroad on his neighbor, then inwardly on himſelf; and all ſtudy more the advancement of a party, then the true intereſt of Religion.

I deny not but zeal for GOD muſt appear when we ſee indignities done to his holy Name in a juſt indignation at theſe who ſo diſhonor him; but what relation have little ſmal differences about matters which have no tendency for advancing the Image of GOD in our ſouls, to that; ſince both ſides of the debate may be well maintained without the leaſt indignity done to GOD, or his holy Goſpel? What oppo-

ppoſition to the will of GOD, or what arm to ſouls can flow from ſo innocent a practiſe, as the fixing ſome Church-men over others, for obſerving, directing, reproving, nd coercing of the reſt, that this ſhould occaion ſuch endleſs brawlings, and ſuch hot conentions? But ſuppoſe the grounds of our diiſions, as great as any angry diſputer can imaine them, then certainly our zeal for them ould be tempered, according to the rules and pirit of the Goſpel. Is it a Chriſtian temper at our ſpirits ſhould boil with rage againſt all f another perſwaſion, ſo that we cannot think f them without ſecret commotions of anger nd diſdain, which breaks often out into ſowr ooks, ridiculous gearings, bitter ſcoffings and nvectives, and in attempts at blood and cruelty? How long ſhal our *Nadabs* and *Abihus* urn this wild-fire on the Altar of GOD, hoſe flames ſhould be peaceful, and ſuch as eſcend from heaven? When we ſee any enangering their ſouls by erroneous opinions, or ad practiſes, had we the divine Spirit in us, it ould ſet us to our ſecret mournings for them: ur hearts would melt in compaſſion towards em, and not burn in rage againſt them: and e would attempt for their recovery, and not ontrive their ruine. The one bears on it a lear impreſs of that nature which is Love, in

which

which none can have intereſt, or union, but ſuch as dwel and abide in Love: but the other bears on it the lively ſignature of him that was a murderer from the beginning: and all that is miſchievous or cruel, is of that evil one, and tends to the ſubverſion of mankind, as well as the ruine of true Religion.

Another great rule by which the peace and order of all humane Societies is maintained and advanced, is obedience to the Laws, and ſubmiſſion to the Authority of theſe whom GOD hath ſet over us, to govern and defend us; to whoſe commands if abſolut obedience be not payed, ever till they contradict the Laws of GOD, there can be neither peace nor order among men, as long as every one prefers his own humor or inclination to the Laws of the Society in which he lives. Now it cannot be denyed to be one of the ſins of the age we live in, that ſmal regard is had to that authority GOD hath committed to his Vicegerents on earth: The evidence whereof is palpable, ſince the bending or ſlackening of the execution of Laws is made the meaſure of moſt mens obedience, and not the conſcience of that duty we owe the commands of our Rulers: for what is more ſervile and unbecoming a man, not to ſay a Chriſtian, then to yeeld obedience when over-awed by force; and to leap from it when allured by

by gentler methods? If Generoſity were our principle, we ſhould be ſooner vanquiſhed by the one, then cudgelled by the other: Or if Conſcience acted us, the obligation of the Law would equally bind, whither backed with a ſtrict execution, or ſlackened into more impunity. Hence it appears how few there are who judge themſelves bound to pay that reverence to the Perſons, and that obedience to the Commands of theſe GOD hath veſted with his authority, which the laws of Nature and Religion do exact. And the root of all this diſobedience and contempt, can be no other, but unruly and ungoverned pride, which diſdains to ſubmit to others, and exalts it ſelf above theſe who are called Gods. The humble are tractable and obedient; but the ſelf-willed are ſtubborn and rebellious. Yet the hight of many mens pride reſts not in a bare diſobedience, but deſigns the ſubverting of Thrones, and the ſhaking of Kingdoms, unleſs governed by their own meaſures.

Among all the Hereſies this age hath ſpawned, there is not one more contrary to the whole deſign of Religion, and more deſtructive of mankind, then is that bloody opinion of defending Religion by armes, and of forcible reſiſtance upon the colour of preſerving Religion. The wiſdom of that Policy is earthly, ſenſual

and

and deviliſh, ſavoring of a carnal unmortified and impatient mind, that cannot bear the croſs, nor truſt to the Providence of GOD: and yet with how much zeal is this doctrine maintained and propagated, as if on it hung both the Law and the Prophets? Neither is the zeal uſed for its defence only meant for the vindicating of what is paſt, but on purpoſe advanced for reacting the ſame Tragedies: which ſome late villanous attempts have too clearly diſcovered, ſome of theſe black Arts (though written in white) being by a happy providence of GOD (by the intercepting of *R. Mac* his letters which contained not a few of their rebellious practiſings and deſigns) brought to light.

Indeed the conſideration of theſe evils ſhould call on all to reflect on the ſad poſture wherein we are, and the evident ſignatures of the Divine diſpleaſure under which we ly: from which it appears that GOD hath no pleaſure in us, nor will be glorified among us: that ſo we may diſcern the *ſigns of the times*, and by all theſe ſad indications may begin to apprehend our danger, and ſo turn to GOD with our whole hearts; every one repenting of the works of his hands, and contributing his prayers and endeavors for a more general Reformation. It is not by Political Arts, nor by the execution of penal Laws, that the power of Religion can be recovere

vered from theſe decays, under which it hath ſo long ſuffered. No, no, we muſt conſider wherein we have provoked GOD to chaſtiſe us in this faſhion, by letting looſe among us a ſpirit of uncharitableneſs, giddineſs, cruelty and ſedition: And the progreſs of theſe and other great evils, we ought to charge on our own faultineſs, who have provoked GOD to plead a controverſie with us in ſo ſevere a manner. This is the method we ought to follow, which if we did, we might ſooner look for the Divine protection and aſſiſtance: and then we ſhould experience it to be better to put our confidence in GOD, then to put our confidence in men.

Indeed ſuch a Reformation of our lives and hearts, would more ſtrongly plead our cauſe, and advance our intereſt, then the moſt learned diſputes, or the ſevereſt Laws, though followed with a moſt vigorous execution: Let us not therefore repine at the contempt we ly under, or the hazard we are expoſed to; nor complain of the non-execution of Laws; but let us examine wherein we have walked contrary to the Laws of CHRIST in his Goſpel, by which we have provoked GOD to render us baſe and contemptible before the people. In a word, if we condemn our ſelves more, and others leſs, and think more of reforming our ſelves, and leſs of puniſhing others, we look not like proper objects

objects of mercy, or fit for a deliverance.

But I ſhal quite this purpoſe to give ſome account of the following Conferences. Some years ago, a ſmal *Book of Dialogues betwixt the Conformiſt and Nonconformiſt* was publiſhed, and received with the general applauſe and good liking of all, who were ſo far unprepoſſeſſed as to conſider the plain and ſimple reaſonings were there laid open; but preſently all the mouthes of the enraged Zealots were ſet a yelping and ſnarling at it, and at its ſuſpected Author: ſome laughed at it, others deſpiſed it, and all of them were angry: ſome threatned a ſpeedy anſwer, others doubting of the performance, ſaid, it deſerved none. At length diverſe pens were ſaid to have undertaken the Task; but in end we had an anſwer from *beyond Sea* to it, which was received with an univerſal ſhout of victory and triumph: the Anſwerer acting his part with ſo much confidence, and edging his ſmatterings with ſo much bitterneſs, as if he had engaged with a compound of Ignorance and Atheiſm. At firſt reading I could not but pity one who triumphed ſo confidently with ſo little reaſon, and regrate the bitterneſs of his ſpirit, who belched up gall and wormwood upon every occaſion. Yet in ſome matters of fact and Hiſtory I deny not but his confidence made me imagine truth might be on his ſide; but when I examined

things

hings from their fountains, I knew not what erdict to paſs on him, who fell in ſo many iſtakes, and ſtumbled at every ſtep. Moſt of s errors I imputed to his ſecond hand reading, r he ſeems to have riſen no higher in his lear- ng then the reading of *Pamphlets*: and it is ke, hath that quarrel with *Antiquity*, that there not a forty year old Author in his Cloſet; and much is he beholding to the labors of others, at if one unplume him of what is borrowed, thing will remain but ſcoldings & non-ſenſe. r when he meets with any thing out of the *d*, it is not unpleaſant to ſee how browillied is; and ſo unequal is his ſtyle, that ſometimes flies high on borrowed wings, and immediat- he halts and crawls when on his own legs. I s not ſoon reſolved whither ſuch a *Scribler* de- ved an Anſwer, ſince all he ſaid that was ma- ial, had both been printed and anſwered full en; yet the confidence of the Author, and the ue which others, much about his own ſize of owledge and modeſty, did ſet on his labors, de me think it neceſſary to ſay a little more theſe things, which were perhaps too overly nced at by the *Conformiſt* in the *Dialogues*: my intereſt in that Perſon ſecured me from rehending his miſtakes of my interpoſing this quarrel; for indeed what he ſaid was ſo from being ſhaken by this pretended trifling

Anſwer, that as a Perſon of great judgement and worth ſaid, *No more pains was needful for refuting the Anſwer, but the reading over the Dialogues, whoſe ſtrength remained entire after all his attempts againſt them.*

I was doubtful what method to purſue in the following ſheets, ſince I ever loathed the anſwering of Books by retail, as an endleſs and worthleſs labor: for when ſhould I have done, did I call him to account for all his incoherencies and impertinencies, and examine all his ſimpering diſtinctions, and whiffling anſwers? I reſolved therefore at one daſh to wave all that, and to examine the matters of greater and more publick concern, with that clearneſs of expreſſion which befits ſuch ſubjects, and with as much brevity, as might not frighten away the more ſuperficial Readers, nor ſurfet the more laborious. Therefore I have not ſtayed to make good all the *Conformiſts* opinions or arguments hinted in theſe ſhort *Dialogues*, but have left the examining of them, and the Anſwers made to them, to the conſideration of the unprejudged Reader, and ſo have conſidered nothing of what he anſwers to the fifth and ſixth *Dialogue*. To the fifth *Dialogue*, wherein ſet forms of worſhip are pleaded for, he anſwers by confeſſing their lawfulneſs, arguing only againſt the impoſing them; but this I meet with in the ſeco

cond *Conference*, wherein I aſſert the binding thority of Laws in all things lawful. And for s Anſwers to the ſixth *Dialogue*, they concern not, being made up of reflections: It is true, ſhow his Common place reading, he gives a ng diſcourſe of Juſtification, but to very little rpoſe, ſince upon the matter the *Conformiſt* ffers nothing from him: And for the juſti-ng or condemning ſome phraſes or modes of ech, they are not worth the while to debate out them: All my quarrel at theſe long win-d Common places, being; that by a pretence making matters clearer, they darken them h a multiplicity of words, and an intricacy of raſes. And as this is juſtly cenſurable on ery head about which it is imployed, ſo it is re particularly in the matter of Juſtification, ich being the ground of our hope and joy, uld be ſo cleared, that no difficulty nor nice-get into our conceptions about it. What n can be clearer then that GOD in conſi-ation of his Sons ſufferings, offers free par-to all ſinners, on the termes of their for-ing their ſins, their accepting his mercy ough his Son, and their obedience to the s of his Goſpel, which whoſoever do, are ually in the favor of GOD, made parta-s of his grace, and ſhal in due time be admit-to his glory? This being the *Conformiſts*

ſenſe on that head, I leave it with all to conſi-
der what reaſon there was for making ſuch ado
about it, or for charging him with ſo heavy im-
putations. But he ſhrowds himſelf under his
own innocency, and will patiently bear all the
inſultings and ungodly rage of that Adverſary
without recriminating or anſwering him in his
own ſtyle and dialect.

I purſue the method of a *Conference*, as be-
ing both more ſutable to the purpoſes here can-
vaſſed, and more agreeable to the *Dialogues*
only I furniſh the Scene with more perſons; and
I am much miſtaken if the Anſwerer himſelf ſha
have ground to accuſe me of not laying out the
ſtrength of his reaſonings faithfully, ſince upon
every occaſion I put in *Iſotimus* his mouth the
ſubſtance of his arguings, as far as I could reach
them. But to make this unpleaſant peace o
contention go the more eaſily off, I have ſubjoy
ned to it an account of the form and rules o
Church-government, as I found them to hav
been received in the firſt and pureſt ages o
the Church: But I add no more for Preface t
that work, ſince in the end of the laſt *Conferen*
enough is ſaid for introduction to it.

I have divided my work in four parts an
Conferences: The firſt examines the opinio
of reſiſting lawful Magiſtrats upon the preten
of defending Religion. The ſecond conſide

th

he authority of Laws, and the obedience due
them, together with the Kings Supremacy in
atters Eccleſiaſtical. The third examines the
irit that acted during the late times and wars,
d continues yet to divide us by Schiſm and
ction. And the fourth examines the lawful-
ſs and uſefulneſs of Epiſcopacy.

I muſt now releaſe my Reader from the de-
this *Introduction* may have occaſioned him,
thout the uſual formality of *Apologies*, for the
fects the following papers are guilty of, ſince
now theſe generally prevail but little for gai-
g what they deſire: but ſhal only ſay, that
s moroſe way of writing, by engaging into
troverſies, is as contrary to my *Genius* as to
mans alive: For I know well how little
h writings prevail for convincing of any, and
t by them the moſt part are rather hardened
more wilfulneſs, and exaſperated into more
erneſs: Yet for this once I was prevailed
to do violence to my own inclinations, by
Patrociny of the authority and laws of that
urch and Kingdom wherein I live.

am ſo far from thinking my ſelf concerned
ake Apology for the ſlowneſs of this Piece
ppearance in publick, that I encline rather
ake excuſes for its coming abroad too ſoon.
at it was ready near a twelve-month ago, can
witneſſed by many who then ſaw it. Yet I

was willing to let it ly ſometime by me, and my averſion from the motions of the Preſs, put it often under debate with me whither I ſhould ſtiffle it, or give it vent: at length I yeelded to the frequent importunities of my friends who aſſaulted me from all hands, and told me how much it was longed for, and what inſulting were made upon the delay of its publication.

And by what is near the end of the third *Conference*, it will appear that it was written before the diſcovery of theſe who had robbed and wounded the Miniſters in the Weſt of *Scotland*. I let what is there ſaid continue as it was written before the diſcovery; but ſhal add ſomewhat here. In *September* laſt, after a new robbery had been committed on another conformable Miniſter, whoſe actors no ſearch could diſcover; ſome few days had not paſſed over, when by a ſtrange Providence one of them was catched on another account by a brave Souldier, and being ſeized, ſuch indications of his acceſſion to the robbery were found about him, that he to prevent torture, confeſſed not only his own guilt but diſcovered a great many more: moſt of them eſcaped, yet three were taken, and had Juſtice done on them, with him who had been their chief Leader: and who continued to carry it out highly after he got his Sentence; talking of his blood as innocently ſhed, and railing

gainſt the Prelats and Curats; though before
entence he was baſely ſordid, as any could be.
ne of his complices who died with more ſenſe,
knowledged, when he ſpake his laſt words,
at bitter zeal had prompted him to that villa-
, and not covetouſneſs, or a deſign of robbing
eir goods. Yet I ſhal not conceal what I was
witneſs to, when a Miniſter of the Presbyte-
n perſwaſion being with them (for two of
em would willingly admit of none that were
iſcopal) after he had taken pains to con-
ce the chief Robber of the atrociouſneſs of
crimes, which was no eaſie task, he charged
m to diſcover if either Gentlemen, or Mini-
rs, had prompted or cheriſhed him in it, or
en conſcious to his committing theſe robbe-
s, he cleared all, except a few particular
d mean perſons who went ſharers with him.
d by this fair and ingenuous procedure, the
ader may judge how far the Author is from a
ſign of lodging infamy on theſe who differ
m him, when of his own accord he offers a
timony for their vindication. But I ſhal
ve this purpoſe, and the further prefacing at
ce.

If my poor labors be bleſſed with any mea-
e of ſucceſs, I humbly offer up the praiſe of it
him from whom I derive all I have, and to
om I owe the praiſe of all I can do. But if

theſe attempts bring forth none of the wiſhed
for effects, I ſhal have this ſatisfaction, that I
have ſincerely and ſeriouſly ſtudied the calming
the paſſions, and the clearing the miſtakes of
theſe among whom I live: ſo that more lyes
not on me, but to follow my endeavors with my
moſt earneſt prayers, that the GOD of Peace
may in this our day, cauſe us diſcern and conſi-
der theſe things which belong to our Peace.

THE HEADS TREATED OF in theſe Conferences.

THe firſt Conference examines the origine and power of Magiſtracy, and whither ſubjects y by armes reſiſt their Soveraigns on the account, pretence of defending Religion againſt Tyranny, d unjuſt oppreſſion? And whither the King of otland be a Soveraign Prince, or limited, ſo that may be called to account, and coerced by force?

The ſecond examines the nature of humane Laws, d of the obedience due to them, and the Civil Ma-trats right of enacting Laws in matters Eccleſia-al.

The third examines the grounds and progreſs of late Warrs, whither they were Defenſive or Inva-, and what Spirit did then prevail? and the grounds ur preſent Schiſm are conſidered.

The fourth examines the origine, lawfulneſs, and fulneſs of Epiſcopal Government, which is conclu-; with an account of the Primitive Conſtitution Government of the Churches that were firſt ga-red and planted.

THE

THE COLLOCUTORS.

Eudaimon.	*A Moderat man.*
Philarchæus.	*An Episcopal man.*
Isotimus.	*A Presbyterian.*
Basilius.	*An Asserter of the Kings authority.*
Criticus.	*One well studied in Scripture.*
Polyhistor.	*An Historian.*

THE

THE FIRST CONFERENCE.

Eudaimon.



OU are welcome, my good friends, and the rather that you come in ſuch a number, whereby our converſe ſhal be the more agreeable. Pray, ſit down.

Philarcheus. The rules of cuſtome ſhould make us begin with asking after our health, and what newes you have.

Eud. Truly the firſt is not worth enquiring after; and for the other, you know how ſeldom I ſtir abroad, and how few break in upon my retirement, ſo that you can expect nothing from me; but you have brought one with you who uſes to know every thing that is done.

Iſotimus. I know you mean me: the truth is, I am very glad to hear every thing that paſſeth; and think it no piece of vertue to be ſo uncon-

unconcerned in what befalls the Church of GOD, as never to look after it: but you are much wronged, if notwithstanding of all your seeming abstraction, you be not deeper in the knowledge of affairs then any of us: however since you expect news from me, I was just now reading some Books lately printed at *Holland*, and particularly an accurate, and learned confutation of these virulent *Dialogues* you were wont to magnifie so much: and it doth my heart good to see how he baffles the writer of them on every occasion; for he hath answered every word of them so well, and so home, that I believe we shal not see a reply in haste.

Philarcheus. I suppose we have all seen the Book, but it is like you are singular in your opinion of it: I shal not deny its Author his deserved praises: he hath been faithful in setting down most of the arguments used in the *Dialogues*, and no less careful to gather together all the vulgar answers to them, and truly hath said as much as can be said for his cause. Neither writes he without art; for when he is pinched, he drives off the Reader with a great many preliminary things, to make him forget the purpose, and to gain a more easie assent to what he asserts. I confess his style is rugged and harsh, so that it was not without pain I wrestled through it: but of all I have seen, he hath fallen on the

surest

reſt way to gain an applauſe from the vulgar;
r he acts the greateſt confidence imaginable,
d rails at his adverſary with ſo much con-
mpt, and malice, that he is ſure to be thought
ell of, by theſe who judge of a man more by
s voice, and the impreſſes of earneſtneſs, and
ſſion he diſcovers, then by the weight of what
ſaith.

Eud. Theſe things may well take with the
norant rabble, with whom it is like he deſigns
triumph: but truly ſuch as underſtand either
e civilities of good nature, or the meekneſs
a Chriſtian, will be little edified with them.
deed I am amazed to ſee ſo much indiſcretion
d bitterneſs fall from any mans pen who hath
ad *S. Paul*, condemning *railings, evil ſurmizings,*
d perverſe diſputings.

Iſot. Who begun the ſcolding? The truth
there are ſome who think they may rail with
riviledge, and if any in ſoberneſs tell them of
eir faults, they accuſe them of bitterneſs: but
s there ever any thing ſeen more waſpiſh then
eſe *Dialogues*? whoſe deſign ſeems to have
en the diſgracing of a whole party, and all
eir actions for many years: If then the Atheiſm,
e blaſphemy, the mockery, the enmity to
O D and Religion, the ignorance, the ma-
e, the folly and arrogance of ſuch a confident
bler be diſcovered, you are ſo tender hoofed

for-

forsooth, as to complain of railings.

End. It seems these writings have made a deep impression on you, you have got so exactly into their style: but this is a place where passion is seldom cherished, therefore we will expect no more of that strain from you. But to deal freely with you, there were some expressions in these *Dialogues* with which I was not well satisfied; but the whole of them had such a visage of serenity, that I wonder how they are so accused. It is true the *Conformist* deals very plainly, and yet ere we part, I can perhaps satisfie you: he said but a little of what he might have said: But withall, remember how severely, he that was meekness it self, treated the *Scribes* and the *Pharisees*, and he having charged his followers to beware of their leaven, it is obedience to his command to search out that leaven, that it may leaven us no more. And when any of a party are so exalted in their own conceit, as to despise and disparage all others, the love, Ministers of the Gospel owe the soules of their flocks, obligeth them to unmask them. As to these poor simple reproaches that are cast on the person of that Author, as they are known to be false and unjust, so they are done in a strain that seems equally void of wit and goodness. But we shal meddle no more in these personal differences, after I have told you what I hear

ard the Author of that *Conference* ſay upon
s ſubject: he ſaid, *He was ſo far from being diſ-*
aſed with the Author of this Anſwer, that he was
y ſory he knew not who he was, that he might ſeek
opportunity of obliging him. For the things char-
d on him, if he was guilty of them, he needed very
ny prayers; but if innocent, the other needed no
er who ſo unjuſtly accuſed him: but a day comes
erein a righteous Judge will judge betwixt them:
this was the utmoſt diſpleaſure. He expreſſed,
ding, *That he had another ſenſe of the account he*
ſt give for his hours, then to engage in a counter-
ffle, or to play at ſuch ſmal game, as a particular
amen of that Book would amount to: And he
dged it *unworthy of him to turn executioner on that*
ans reputation, by enquiring into all the eſcapes of
Book which are too obvious. But he is willing
ſtand or fall by the deciſion of rational and
partial minds, only where he was either too
ort, or where the Anſwerer hath raiſed ſo
uch miſt as might obſcure a leſs diſcerning
eader: he will (when he gets out of the throng
herein his employment doth at preſent en-
ge him) offer a clearer account of the mat-
s in queſtion, without tracing of that *poor*
ature, who, it is like, expects to be recorded
ong the learned Writers of the age, and the
hampions of truth.

Baſ. We have nothing to do with what is

per-

perſonal among theſe Writers: But ſince ſo many of us have met ſo happily, and ſeem a little acquainted with theſe Queſtions, let us according to our wonted freedom, toſs theſe debates among us, without heat or reflections which ſignifie nothing but to expreſs the ſtrength of his paſſions, and the weakneſs of his reaſons who makes uſe of them. And indeed the matter of the greateſt importance is, *the point of ſubjects reſiſting their Soveraigns, in the defence of Religion*, which deſerves to be the better cleared, ſince it is not a nicety of the School, or a ſpeculation of Philoſophers, but a matter of practiſe, and that which (if received) ſeems to threaten endleſs warrs and confuſions.

Crit. I am no great Diſputer, but ſhal be gladly a witneſs to your debate, and upon occaſions ſhal preſume to offer what I have gleaned among the Critical Writers on Scripture: and I hope *Iſotimus* his memory is ſo good, that he will carefully ſuggeſt the arguments uſed by the Patrons of defenſive armes.

Iſot. I will not undertake too much, but ſhal take care not to betray this good cauſe, yet I will not have the verdict paſſed upon my defence of it; however I ſhal not ſnake ſo ſhamefully as the *Nonconformiſt* did in the *Dialogues*.

End. I hope I ſhal not need to caution you

y more againſt reflections: but as for the al-
dged treachery of your friend the *Nonconfor-*
ſt, it may be referred to all *Scotland*, if what
ſaith be not what is put in the mouthes of all
e people about theſe matters, and truly this
nſwer adds ſo little to him, that nothing can
ee him ſo well of that treachery, as the rea-
ng of this new Book. But to our purpoſe:
he Queſtion is firſt in general, *If ſubjects under*
awful Soveraign when oppreſſed in their eſtabliſhed
ligion, may by armes defend themſelves, and reſiſt
Magiſtrats? Let this be firſt diſcuſſed in
neral, and next it ſhal be conſidered how far
s will quadrat with our preſent caſe, or our
e troubles.

Iſot. I like your method well, and that we
y follow it, conſider *(ſee pag. 20. of the An-*
r, and Jus populi all over) if there can be any
ng more evident from the *Laws of Nature,*
that men ought to defend themſelves, when un-
ly aſſaulted? And ſince the Law of Nature
cheth men not to murder themſelves, it by
ſame force binds them to hinder another to
t, ſince he that doth not hinder another from
mmitting a crime, when it is in his power ſo
o, becomes guilty of the crime committed;
s then a ſelf-murderer who doth not defend
nſelf from unjuſt force. Beſides, what is the
of all Societies, but mutual protection?

Did not the people at first chooſe Princes for their protection? Or do you imagine it was to ſatisfie the pride and cruelty of individual perſons? It was then the end of Societies, that Juſtice and Peace might be maintained: ſo when this is inverted, the ſubjects are again to reſume their own conditional ſurrender, and to coërce the Magiſtrat, who forgetful of the ends of his authority, doth ſo corrupt it. And ſince the great deſign of man ſhould be *to ſerve GOD and to worſhip him in ſpirit and in truth*, this is to be preferred to all things elſe, as being of the greateſt importance. If then Magiſtrats whom *S. Peter* (*1. Pet. 2. 13.*) calls *the ordinances of men*, or humane creatures, do force their ſubjects from the true worſhip of GOD, they ought to be reſtrained, and the cauſe of GOD muſt be maintained, notwithſtanding of the unjuſt Laws or cruel tyranny.

Baſ. You have indeed put ſuch colours on your opinion, that I ſhould be much ſhaken from mine, were not my perſwaſion well grounded. But to examine what you have ſaid, you muſt diſtinguiſh well betwixt the *Laws of Nature*, and *the rights or permiſſions of Nature*: the firſt are unalterable obligations, by which all men are bound, which can be reverſed by no poſitive Law, and tranſgreſſed by no perſon upon no occaſion: for the Law of Nature is the

ima

mage of GOD yet remaining in ſome de-
rees on the ſouls of men, and is nothing elſe
ave certain notions of truth, impreſſed by
GOD on the ſouls of all men that enjoy the
xerciſe of reaſon. Now ſelf-defence cannot
e a Law of Nature, otherwiſe it could never be
iſpenſed with without a ſin; nay, were a man ne-
er ſo criminal: For as in no caſe a man may
ill himſelf, were he never ſo guilty; ſo by that
aſoning of yours, he ought not to ſuffer him-
lf to be killed, neither ſhould any malefactor
bmit to the Sentence of the Judge, but ſtand
his defence by all the force he could raiſe.
nd it will not ſerve turn, to ſay, that for the
ood of the Society he ought to ſubmit; for no
an muſt violat the Laws of Nature, were it on
ever ſo good a deſign: and ſince the utmoſt
ndard of our love to our Neighbors, is to
ve them as our ſelves, no conſideration of the
ood of others can oblige one to yeeld up his
e, if bound by the Law of Nature to de-
nd it.

Crit. If I may interrupt you, I ſhould tell you
at as among all Nations it hath been counted
eroical to die for ones Countrey, or for the
ood of others, ſo the Apoſtle ſpeaks, (*Rom.*
7.) of thoſe *who for good men would dare to die.*
ut chiefly CHRISTS dying for us, ſhows
at ſelf-defence can be no Law of Nature:

otherwise CHRIST who filled all righte-ousnes, had never contradicted the Laws of Nature.

Bas. I thank you for your remark which was pertinent. But next, consider there are some *rights or permissions of Nature*, which are allowed us, but not required of us, as *propriety of goods*, *marriage*, and other such like things, which whoso doth not pretend to, he cannot be said to violate the Laws of Nature, only for some greater consideration he forgoes these priviledges it allowes. And take men out of a Society, I acknowledge forcible resistance of any violent assaillant, to be one of the rights of Nature, which every man may make use of without a fault, or dispense with likewise at his pleasure: But Societies being Associations of people under a Head who hath the power of life and death, that set it beyond doubt, that the Head must only judge when the subjects do justly forc-seal their lives or not: which before I go about to evince, I must remove that vulgar error, of a Magistrat his deriving his power from the surrender of the people. None can surrender what they have not: take then a multitude of people not yet associated, none of them hath power of his own life neither hath he power of his neighbors, since no man out of a Society may kill another, were his crime never so great, much less be his own

mu

murderer; and a multitude of people not yet associated, are but so many individual persons; therefore the power of the sword is not from the people, nor any of their delegation, but is from GOD.

Isot. You will pardon me to tell you, that the people must give the power, since GOD did never by a voice from heaven, or by a Prophets cõmand, except in some instances among the *Israelits*, where even that was not done, but upon the previous desire of the people. And what you say of the peoples having no right to kill themselves, they only consent to submit to the Magistrats Sentence, when guilty.

Basil. This will then infallibly prove, that visible self-defence cannot be a Law of Nature, but only a right; otherwise we could not dispense with it. But if though guilty, I might not to kill my self, neither can I so much consent that another do it: Hence it is, that the original of *Magistracy* must be from GOD, who only can invest the *Prince* with the power of the sword.

Polyb. I could say much in confirmation of this, from the universal sense of all Nations, who ever looked on the Magistrats power, as sacred and divine: but these things are so copiously adduced by others, that I may well spare the labor.

Crit. Nay, a greater authority is *S. Pauls*, *Rom.* 13. 1. who ſaith, *That the powers that were then, were ordained of GOD:* which on the way ſaith ſtrongly, for aſſerting the right of a Conqueror, after ſome preſcription, ſince if either we conſider the power of the *Roman Empire* over the world, or of their Emperors over them both will be found to have no better tittle then conqueſt, and yet they were ordained of GOD and not to be reſiſted, but ſubmitted to, under the hazard of *reſiſting the ordinance of GOD* and *receiving of damnation*, *(p.2.)* And it is like the ſacredneſs of the *Magiſtrats power*, was a part of the traditional Religion conveyed from *Noah* to his poſterity, as was the practiſe of expiatory ſacrifices.

Baſil. It is not to be denyed but a people may chooſe their own form of Government and the perſons in whoſe hands it ſhal be depoſitated: and the Soveraignty is in their hands of whom they do thus freely make choice: that if they expreſly agree, that any Adminiſtrators of the power, by what name ſoever determined, Kings, Lords, or whatever elſe, ſhall be accountable to them; in that caſe, the Soveraignty lyes in the major part of the people, and theſe Adminiſtrators are ſubject to them, as to the Supreme. But when it is agreed in what hands the Soveraign power lyes, and that

t with the people, then if the people pretend the ſword, they invade GODS right, and at which he hath devolved on his Vicegerent. d as in marriage either of the parties make a e choice, but the Marriage-bond is of GOD, ither is it free for them afterwards to reſile on pretence of injuries, till that which GOD th declared to be a breach of the bond, be mmitted by either party: ſo though the elec- on of the Soveraign may be of the people, the ty of ſubjection is of GOD, and there- e is not to be ſhaken off, without we have ex- ſs warrant from him. And according to ur reaſoning, one that hath made a bad choice his marriage, may argue that marriage was ended for a help and comfort to man, and for opagation; therefore when theſe things are ſſed in a marriage, that voluntary contract y be reſiled from: and all this will conclud well to unty an ill choſen marriage, as to ke off a Soveraign.

Philarch. To this reaſoning I ſhal add what ms from rational conjectures, and ſuch hints we can expect of things at ſo great a diſtance m us, to have been the riſe of Magiſtracy. e find no warrant to kill, no not for murder fore the Flood, as appears from the inſtances *Cain* and *Lamech*, ſo no Magiſtracy appears have been then: Yet from what GOD ſaid

to *Cain*, *Gen.* 4. 7. we see, *the elder brother was to rule over the younger.* But the want of Magistracy before the *Flood*, was perhaps none of the least occasions of the wickedness *which was great upon earth*; but to *Noah* was the Law first given of punishing murder by death, *Gen.* 9. 6. and he was undoubtedly clothed with that power. So his eldest son coming in his place by the right of representation, and being by the right of primogeniture asserted before the *Flood* to be over his brethren, was clothed with the same power, and so it should have descended by the order of Nature still to the first born. But afterwards Families divided, and went over the world to people it, whereby the single jurisdiction of one Emperor, could not serve the ends of Government, especially in that rude time, in which none of these ways of correspondence which after ages have invented, were fallen upon. These Families did then, or at least by that Law of GOD of the elder brother's power, ought to have been subject to the elder of their several families.

And another rise of *Magistracy*, was the poverty of many who sold themselves to others that were richer, and were in all Nations subject to them, both they and their children: and this was very early begun, for *Abrahams* family consisted of 318. persons, and the many little

Kings

ngs at that time ſeem to have riſen out of ſe Families: for the poſterity of theſe ſer- ts were likewiſe under the Maſters autho- y: and theſe ſervants were by their Maſters aſure to live or die; nor had they any right to ſt this unjuſt force: But afterwards emanci- ion was uſed, ſome dominion being ſtill re- ved: and it is highly probable, that from ſe numerous Families, did moſt of the little ngdoms then in the world ſpring up; after- ds the more aſpiring came to pretend over ers, and ſo great Empires roſe by their con- ſts.

Crit. I know it is ſtrongly pretended, that ſtate of ſervitude, or ſuch a ſurrender of s life, or liberty, as ſubjects it to the tyranny nother, is not lawful: but this will be found undleſs: for though *even the Law of GOD nted the ſervants a mans money, ſo that he was o be puniſhed, though he had ſmitten them with a , ſo that they died, provided they lived a day or after it*, *Exod.* 21. 20.21. Yet in that diſpen- on it was not unlawful to be a ſervant; nay, unlawful to continue in that ſtate for ever, not accept of the emancipation which was vided to them in *the year of Jubily*. Neither his ſtate declared unlawful under the Goſpel, e *S. Paul* ſaith, 1. *Cor.* 7. 21. *Art thou called g a ſervant, care not for it: but if thou mayſt be free,*

free, use it rather: By which we see the Gosp
doth not emancipat servants, but placeth th
state among things which may be lawfully sub
mitted to, though liberty be preferable.

Basil. From this it may be well inferred, th
if a Society have so intirely surrendered them
selves that they are in no better case then wer
the servants among the *Romans* or *Hebrews*, th
thing is not unlawful; nor can they make it voi
or resume the freedom without his consen
whose servants they are: and as *S. Peter* tell
1. *Pet.* 2. 18. *The servants to submit to their Ma
sters, though punishing them wrongfully.* By who
all know that he means not of hired, but o
bought servants: so if a people be under an
degrees of that state, they ought to submit, no
only to the good, but to the froward: and sti
it appears that the sword is only in the Mag
strats hand, and that the people have no clai
to it. It is true, in case the Magistrat be fu
rious, or desert his right, or expose his King
doms to the fury of others, the Laws and sen
of all Nations agree, that the States of th
Land are to be the Administrators of the powe
till he recover himself: But the instance of *Ne
buchadnezar*, *Dan.* 4. 26. shows, that still th
Kingdom should be sure to him when he rec
vers.

Isot. Now you begin to yeeld to truth, an
co

nfeſs, that a Magiſtrat, when he groſly abu-
h his power, may be coërced: this then
ws that the people are not ſlaves.

Baſil. The caſe varies very much when the
nſe is ſuch that it tends to a total ſubverſion,
ich may be called juſtly *a phreneſie*, ſince no
n is capable of it till he be under ſome leſion
his mind; in which caſe, the power is to be
miniſtred by others, for the Prince and his
ples ſafety: But this will never prove that
Magiſtrat governing by Law, though there be
eat errors in his Government, ought to be
ërced: otherwiſe you muſt open a door to
rpetual broils, ſince every one by theſe ma-
nes becomes Judge; and where he is both
dge and party, he is not like to be caſt in his
etenſions: And even few malefactors die, but
ey think hard meaſure is given them. If then
rcible ſelf-defence be to be followed, none of
eſe ſhould yeeld up their lives without uſing
attempts for reſcuing them.

Eud. Whatever other caſes allow of, certain-
the defence of Religion by armes is never to
e admitted: for the nature of Chriſtian Reli-
ion is ſuch, that it excludes all carnal weapons
om its defence. And when I conſider how ex-
reſly *CHRIST forbids his diſciples to reſiſt evil*,
Matth. 25. 39. how ſeverely that reſiſtance is
ondemned by *S. Paul*, and that *condemnation* is
decla-

declared the punishment of it, I am forced
cry out, Oh! what times have we fallen i
in which men dare against the expres laws
the Gospel, defend that practise upon whi
GOD hath passed this condemnation, *If wh*
soever break the least of these commandments, a
teach men so to do, shal be called the least in t
Kingdom of GOD: What shal their portion b
who teach men to break one *of the greatest of the*
commandments, such as are the laws of pea
and subjection? And what may we not look fo
from such Teachers, who dare taxe that gl
rious Doctrine of patient suffering, as brutis
and irrational, and though it be expresly sai
1. *Pet.* 2. 21. *That CHRIST by suffering fo*
us, left us his example how to follow his steps, whic
was followed by a glorious cloud of witnesses
Yet in these last days, what a brood hath sprun
up, *Of men who are lovers of their own selves, tra*
tors, heady, high minded, lovers of pleasures, mor
then lovers of GOD: having a form of godlines
but denying the power thereof; who creep into house
and lead captive silly women loden with sin? It i
our sins that provoke GOD to open the *bot*
tomles pit, and let loose such *locusts*; but were w
turning to GOD, and repenting of the works
of our hands, we might hope that their powe
should be taken from them, and that their foll
should be made known to all men.

Isot.

Sot. Who talk bigly now? But let reaſon Scripture take place, and you ſhal find good rants in the *Old Teſtament* for coërcing the giſtrat, and ſubjecting the power in the peo- hands, *(ſee p.* 12.*)* for the people were ranted to *puniſh Idolaters*, *Deut.* 13.12. And m the beginning of *Deuteronomy*, it appears Bookwas directed to all *Iſrael*, therefore any ht have puniſhed Idolaters; therfore the po- of reforming is with the people: And again *p.*13.*)* the *Law of the King* is ſet down, *Deut.* 14. which gives a clear evidence, that the ple might coërce him otherwiſe. Why was Law delivered to the people?

rit. I am much deceived if theſe inſtances cõclud for your deſign, ſince the utmoſt they prove, is, that ſome ſhare of the executive er lay in hands of the people among the ; but that proves nothing: where by Law practiſe it is clear the power is wholly in hands of ſuperior unaccountable Magi- ts But that the Law of the King, or of iſhing Idolaters was delivered to the people, ves not that they muſt execute it: For the of Sacrifices, and all the Temple-worſhip alſo delivered to them: but I hope you will from that infer, that the people were to ge in theſe matters, or to give Laws to their eſts: neither will the Law, becauſe addreſſed

to

to the people, prove themselves to be the ex
cutors of it; otherwise the *Epistle to the Cor*
thians addressed *to all the Saints in Corinth*, w
prove the people the *Judges of excommunicatio*
and *of the rules of Church-worship*, which are the
delivered: so that though the Law was dir
&ted to all the people, yet that proves not th
every precept of it concerned all the peopl
but that the whole of the Law was addressed
the whole people, and the respective parts
it, to all the individuals, according to their
veral stations: And after all this, you are to co
sider that some things were allowed by that L
to privat persons, which ought never to be ma
precedents: for the Law allowed the frien
of one that was killed by chance, to avenge
blood on the person that slew him, if he k
not within the City of Refuge: but that be
a particular provision of their Judicial and M
nicipal Law, will be no warrant for such
venge in other States.

Isot. But what say you to the revolt of
nah, 2. *Chron.* 21. 10. which revolted from
horam, because he *forsook the LORD G*
of his fathers: And of *Amaziah*, 2. *Chron.*
27. who when he turned away from follow
the LORD, his being killed by a conspir
of these in *Jerusalem*, and the *fourscore val*
Priests who withstood *Uzziah*, when he wen

er incenſe? 2. *Chron.* 26. 17. *See p.* 13. 14.
Crit. As for your inſtances, conſider that ma-
things are ſet down in the *Old Teſtament*, that
undoubted faults, and yet ſo far are they
m being taxed, that they rather ſeem to be
lauded: ſo it is in the caſe of the *Mid-*
es lie, not to mention the *Polygamy of the Pa-*
rchs; therefore it not being clear to us by
at ſpecial warrants they acted, a practiſe of
t diſpenſation will be no precedent to us.
t for that of *Libnah*, it may be juſtly doubted
he *Libnah* there mentioned, be that City
ich was aſſigned to the *Prieſts*: for *Numbers*
20. we meet with a *Libnah* in the journeyings
ſrael; and both the *Syriack* and the *Arabick*
on, have underſtood the place of that City;
they render it, the *Idumeans that dwelt at Lib-*
. But whatever be in this, the particle *be-*
ſe, doth not always import the deſign of the
r: which if you examine the *Hebrew*, will
very clear; and I ſhal name but one place to
ſfie you, 1. *Sam.* 2. 25. *Elies ſons hearkned not*
he voyce of their father, becauſe the LORD
ld ſlay them. But, I doubt not, you will
feſs this was not their motive to ſuch diſo-
ience: ſo this will import no more, but
t GOD in his Providence permitted that
olt for a puniſhment of *Jehorams* apoſtaſie:
her will fair pretences juſtifie bad actions:

ſo

ſo the utmoſt that place can prove, is, that the made that their pretence. But that their revo could not be without they had alſo revolte from GOD, will appear from this, that t Prieſts were bound to give attendance by tur at the Temple, ſo none of them could have r volted from the King without their rejecting GODS ſervice, as long as the King was M ſter of *Jeruſalem*, whither no doubt they wou not have come during their revolt.

As for your inſtance of *Amaziah*, I confeſs is plain dealing, and you diſcloſe the *Myſte of defenſive arms*, that it is but lamely maintaine till the doctrine of murdering of Kings be a afferted: And indeed your friend by this ing nuity of his, hath done that cauſe a prejudic of which many are ſufficiently ſenſible; for t was a ſecret doctrine to be inſtilled in corne in the hearts of diſciples duly prepared for but not to be owned to the world: For if t place prove any thing, it will prove that whe King turns from following the LORD, ſubjects may conſpire and ſlay him; how t would take among the *fifth Monarchy-men* know not; but I am ſure it will be abhorred all *Proteſtants*: and particularly by theſe w made it an Article of their Confeſſion of Fai That infidelity or difference of Religion, do not make void the Magiſtrats juſt powe

the

herefore this being a direct breach of both
h and ſixth Commands, though it be nei-
r marked as condemned, nor puniſhed in
t ſhort account there given, yet it will never
rrant the reſiſting the Ordinance of GOD,
on which GOD hath entailed damnation.
d whereas your friend alledgeth the juſtice
this may be evinced from Scripture, it ſhows
t in his judgement, not only Tyranny, but
turning from following GOD, is a juſt
ſe for conſpiring againſt, and killing of
ngs: But I cannot ſee where he finds what
cauſe of this conſpiracy was, ſince the Text
eth only the time, but not the cauſe of it.
And for the inſtance of *Uzziah*, the Prieſts
eed withſtood him, as they ought to have
e, as the Miniſters of the Goſpel ought
to do, if a King would go and conſecrat
LORDS Supper: but their withſtan-
g of that, imports no violent oppoſition; the
t ſignification of the word being only, that
y *placed themſelves over againſt him*, and ſo it
endered by the *LXX. Interpreters*; and re-
mber *that S. Paul withſtood S. Peter to his face*,
. 2. 11. Yet I do not apprehend you will
pect he uſed force. As for what follows,
t the Prieſts *did thruſt him out*, it will not
ve they laid hands on him, that word ſigni-
ng only, *that they made him haſte out of the*

Temple: and is the same word which *Esther* 6. 14. is rendered, *hasted*, where none will think that the Chamberlanes laid violent hands on *Haman*: so all that the Priests did, was to charge *Uzziah*, when his Leprosie appeared, to get him quickly out of the Temple: and some Copies of the *LXX*. have it so rendered: and the following words show there was no need of using force, since himself made haste. And for the word rendered *valiant*, or *sons of valor*, that word is not always taken for *valor*, but sometimes for *activity*; so *Gen.* 47. 6. sometimes for *riches*, so *Ruth* 2. 1. It is also rendered *wealth* *Gen.* 34. 29. so this will not prove that *Azariah* made choice of these men for the strength of their body, but for the resolution of their mind that they might stoutly contradict *Uzziah*; and thus you have drawn a great deal more from me then I intended, or these misapplyed places needed, for clearing of them from the design you had upon them.

Isot. But is it not clear from 1. *Sam.* 14. 45. that *the people of Israel rescued Jonathan from his fathers bloody sentence against him, and swore he should not die?* *See pag.* 15.

Crit. That will prove as little; for no force was used in the matter, only a solemn protestation was made. Next, the word rendered, *scued*, is, *redeemed*, which is not used in a se-

at imports violence in Scripture; but rather
r a *thing done by contract and agreement:* And the
XX. Interpreters render it, *the people intreated for*
nathan: nor need we doubt but *Saul* was ea-
y prevailed upon to yeeld to their desire.
esides any King that would murder his eldest
n and heir of his Crown upon so bare a pre-
nce, after he had signalized his courage so no-
bly, as *Jonathan* did, may well be looked upon
one that is furious; and so the holding of his
nds, is very far different from the case of de-
nsive armes.

Ist. But *David*, *a man according to* GODS
art, *gathered four hundred men about him*, *and*
od to his defence, *when cruelly persecuted by* Saul,
Sam. 22. 2.

Basil. Many things meet in this instance to
ke away any colour of an argument might be
awn from it: for *David* was by GODS
mmand designed successor to the Crown, and
was no ordinary subject. Next, *Saul* was
come furious, and an evil spirit seized on him,
that in his rage he threw Javelins, not only at
avid, but at his son *Jonathan*. Now all con-
s, that when a Soveraign is frenetick, his fury
ay be restrained. Further, we see how far
avid was from resistance, he standing on a pure
fence, so that when he had *Saul* in his power
ice, he would do him no hurt; yea, *his heart*

smote him when he cut off the hem of his garment
1. *Sam.* 24 4. 5. This was not like some yo
know of, who set guards about their King (fo
the security of his Person forsooth) when h
had trusted himself into their hands. And it i
very doubtful if *Davids* gathering that forc
about him was lawful; for these who came t
him were naughty men, and discontented an
broken with debt; whereas had that been a ju
stifiable practise, it is like he should have ha
another kind of following. And his offering hi
service to the *Philistins*, who were enemies t
GOD, to fight for them against the peopl
of GOD, is a thing which can admit of n
excuse. But after all this, if the actions even o
renowned Persons in the Old Dispensation b
precedents, you may adduce the instances o
Ehud, to prove that we may secretly assassinat
Tyrant; and of *Jael*, to prove that after we hav
offered protection to one who upon that trus
to us, we may secretly murder him.

Isot. But what say you to the resistance use
by *Mattathias*, and his children, who kille
the Kings Officers, and armed against him
which resistance, as it was fore-told by *Danie*
so it is said by the Author of the *Epistle* to th
Hebrews, That *by faith they waxed valiant in figh*
and turned to flight the armies of aliens: which b
all is applyed to the *Maccabees*. And wh
an

e you to condemn that which the holy Ghost lls the work of faith in them? *See p.* 18. 19.

Basil. I see *Criticus* weary of speaking, and erefore will relieve him for this once, and tell u, that the title *Antiochus* had to command e *Jews*, is not undoubted: for *Josephus lib.* 12. . 7. *and* 8. shows how the *Jewish* Nation was fed betwixt hands, and sometimes in the po- r of the Kings of *Egypt*, and sometimes of *Sy-* ; and that the factions among the *Jews*, gave occasion to their being so invaded; for am- ious pretenders to the High Priesthood, ght the favor of these Kings, and so sacrifi- the interests both of Religion, and their ntrey to their own base ends: which was case in *Antiochus Epiphanes* his time, who af- his attempt upon *Egypt*, came against *Jerusa-* , to which he was admitted by the men of party, who opened the gates to him: after ich, he polluted their worship and Temple, fell on the cruellest persecution imaginable. w his title over them being so ill grounded, ir asserting their freedom and Religion a- nst that cruel and unjust invader, was not of nature of subjects resisting their Soveraign. ides, what is brought from the *Epistle* to the *brews ch.* 11. for justifying these wars, seems applyed: for from the end of the 32. *verse*, ppears he only speaks there of what was

done in the times of the Prophets, and none o
these being during the time of the *Maccabees*
that is not applicable to them. Next, as for *Ma*
tathias, I must tell you that GOD often raised u
extraordinary persons to judge *Israel*, whose pra
ctises must be no rule to us: for GOD sets u
Kings and Rulers at his pleasure: and in the Ol
Dispensation he frequently sent extraordinar
persons to do extraordinary things, who wer
called *Zealots:* & such was *Samuels* hewing *Ag*
in pieces before the LORD, *Elijah* his causin
kill the Priests of *Baal*, which was not done upo
the peoples power to kill Idolaters; but *Elij*
having by that signal miracle of fire falling fro
heaven, proved both that GOD was th
LORD, and only to be worshipped, and th
he was his Prophet, and commanding the
Priests to be killed, he was to be obeyed. O
the same nature was his praying for fire fro
heaven on the Captains who came to take hi
and *Elisha* his cursing of the children who r
proached him. From these precedents we s
it is apparent that often in the Old Dispen
tion, the power of the sword, both ordina
and extraordinary, was assumed by persons se
of GOD, which will never warrant priv
and ordinary uninspired persons to do the lik

Isot. I acknowledge this hath some groun
but the first instãce of these *Zealots*, was *Phinch*

whom we find no veſtige of an extraordinary
ſſion, and yet he killed *Zimri* and *Cosbi*, for
ich he was rewarded with an everlaſting
eſthood: So a zeal for GOD in extraor-
ary caſes, ſeems warrant enough for extraor-
ary practiſes. *Pag.* 382. *to* 405.

Baſil. If you will read the account of that
ion given by *Moſes*, it will clear you of all
ur miſtakes: ſince *Phinehas* had the warrant
he Magiſtrat for all he did, for *Moſes* be-
then the perſon in whoſe hands the civil
wer was committed by GOD, did ſay to
Judges of *Iſrael*, *Numb.* 25. 5. *Slay ye every*
his men that were joyned to Baal Peor. Now
t *Phinehas* was a Judge in *Iſrael* at that time,
ot to be doubted; for *Eleazar* was then High
eſt, and by that means exempted from that
hority, which when his father *Aaron* lived,
s in his hand, *Numb.* 3. 32. and he being now
is fathers place, there is no ground to doubt
Phinehas was alſo in his, and ſo as one of the
dges, he had received command from *Mo-*
to execute judgement on theſe impure Ido-
ers, which he did with ſo much noble zeal,
t the Plague was ſtayed, and GODS wrath
rned away. But if this conclude a precedent,
will prove too much, both that a Church-man
y execute judgement, and that a privat per-
in the ſight of a holy Magiſtrat, without

waiting for his Justice, may go and puni
crimes. From the instances adduced, it w
appear how *Zealots* were ordinarly raised up
that Dispensation: But when two of CHRIST
Disciples lay claim to that priviledge of prayi
for fire from heaven, he gives check to the fe
vor of their thundring zeal, & tells them, *Luk.*
55.56. *You know not what spirit you are of:* addin
that *the Son of man was not come to destroy mens liv*
but to save them: Whereby he shows that thogh
the Old Dispensation, GOD having by his o
command given his people a title to invade t
Nations of *Canaan*, & extirpat them, having a
given them Political Laws for the administr
tion of Justice, and order among them, it w
proper for that time that GOD should ra
up Judges to work extraordinary deliveran
to his people, whose example we are not now
imitate. GOD also sent Prophets, who had
sometimes in Commission to execute Justice
transgressors; yet in the New Dispensatio
these things were not to take place, where
have no temporal *Canaan*, nor Judicial Laws
ven us; and consequently none are now extra
dinarily called in the Name of GOD, to infl
ordinary and corporal punishments.

Having said all this, it will be no hard task
make it appear that *Mattathias* was a perl
extraordinarily raised up by GOD, as we

Judges. And though no mention of that be
e, neither by *Josephus*, nor the Book of
Maccabees, that is not to be stood upon; for
have many of the Judges of *Israel*, of whose
no account is given, and yet undoubtedly
y were warranted to act as they did, other-
e they had been Invaders. But if that pra-
e of *Mattathias* conclud any thing by way
precedent, it will prove that Church-men
y invade the Magistrats Office, and kill his
icers, and raise war against him.

Crit. I wonder we hear not *Isotimus* alledging
practise of the ten Tribes, who rejected *Re-*
oam, and made choice of *Jeroboam*, which
h to be very confidently adduced, for pro-
g it to be the peoples right to give Laws to
ir Princes, and to shake them off when they
se obedience to their desires. But to this
all other instances of this nature, it is to be
wered, that the *Jewish* State being a *Theocra-*
as it is called by their own Writers, their
ges, and many of their Kings had their title
m GODS designation, and the possession
s only yeelded to them by the people, accor-
g to the command, *Deut.* 17. 15. *To set him*
ng over them whom the LORD *their* GOD
choose: So when they sought a King, they
ne to *Samuel*, as the known Prophet of GOD,
d desired him to give them a King, which he
after-

afterwards did. In like manner was *David* d
ſigned to ſucceed *Saul*, by the ſame Proph
and upon *Sauls* death, the Tribe of *Judah* ca
and acknowledged, and anointed him Kin
which was the ſolemn inveſtiture in that
which he had formerly a right.

Jeroboam being by the ſame authority de
ned King over the ten Tribes by the mouth
Ahijah in the Name of GOD, 1. *Kings* 11.
from v. 28. he derived his Title from that: a
there was as good warrands for the people
reject *Rehoboam*, and follow him, as was forme
to quite *Iſhboſheth*, and follow *David*.

Another inſtance of this nature is *Eliſha*
ſending one to *Jehu*, where that young Prop
ſaith, 2. *Kings* 9. 6. *Thus ſaith the LORD G*
of Iſrael, I have anointed thee King over the pe
of the LORD, even over Iſrael: Upon the not
whereof, *v.* 13. he is declared King. Th
inſtances will ſufficiently prove what I have
ledged, that the Kings of the *Hebrews* hav
their right from GOD, were to be chan
when the moſt High *who ruleth in the King*
of men, and giveth it to whomſoever he will, and
teth up over it the baſeſt of men, interpoſed his
thority and command. One word more, a
I have done. When the Law of the Judge
ſet down, *Deut.* 17. 12. all who do preſu
tuouſly, and hearkened not unto the Judge,
ſent

nced to death, *That evil might be put away Iſrael, whereby the people might hear, and fear, do no more preſumptuouſly.* This ſhows that lute ſubmiſſion was due to the Judges, un- he pain of death; whereby all privat mens ing of their ſentence is ſtruck out. It is the other laws that prefer the Commands OD to the laws of men, do neceſſarly oſe the exception of unlawful commands: nce no law warrants the reſiſting their ſen- e, it will clearly follow that abſolut ſubmiſ- was due to theſe Judges.

aſil. Truly theſe things as they ſeem to be made out from Scripture, ſo they ſtand reaſon, ſince no order can be expected ng men, unleſs there be an uncontrollable unal on earth. Our conſciences are in- only within GODS Juriſdiction: but ere be not a Supream Power to cognoſce determine about our actions, there muſt fol- endleſs confuſions, when any number of ple can be got to mutiny againſt Laws: there- there muſt be a Supream Court. But the s and ſettled practiſes of Kingdoms, muſt rmine in whoſe perſon this lyes, whither in gle Perſon, the Nobility, or the Major part he People? Yet I deſire to hear what de- ns the *New Teſtament* offers in this que- n.

Crit.

Crit. Truly that will be ſoon diſpatch
conſider then how our LORD, *Matth.*
forbids us *to reſiſt evil*; where it is true, he e
merats only ſmal injuries: ſo I ſhal not deny
that place will amount no further, then that
ought to bear ſmal injuries, rather then reve
or oppoſe them; but you muſt yeeld to the
ctrine of ſubmiſſion, if afterwards you conſi
how our LORD tells us, *Matth.* 11. 29.
learn of him, for he was meek; and that he c
demns the thundering fervor of his Diſcipl
who called for fire from heaven, ſhowing
nature of the New Diſpenſation to be quite d
ferent from the Old, in that particularly, that
Son of man came not to deſtroy mens lives, but to ſ
them: And chiefly that when he was to give
greateſt inſtance wherein we ſhould imitat hi
he refuſed the defence of the ſword, and co
manded *S. Peter to put up his ſword*, *Ma*
26. 52.

Iſot. If you urge this too much, then mu
anſwer, that by the ſame conſequence you m
prove we muſt caſt our ſelves on dangers,
not flee from them: ſince we find CHRI
going up to *Jeruſalem*, though he knew w
was abiding him there: neither did he fly, wh
yet himſelf allowed. Beſides, you may as w
urge againſt all prayer to GOD for deli
rance; his not praying for Angels to aſſiſt hi

he clear account of this is given by himſelf, the Scriptures were to be fulfilled which told his death. *See p.* 24. *and Anſwer to the about Jus populi.*

ut. I muſt confeſs my ſelf amazed at this er, when I find *S. Peter* ſaying expreſly, . 2. 21. *That* CHRIST *ſuffered, leaving example that we might follow his ſteps*, and ap- g this to the very caſe of ſuffering wrong- ; and that notwithſtanding of that, you d ſtudy to pervert the Scripture ſo groſly es: conſider that CHRIST was *to ful- righteouſneſs*; if then the Laws of Nature our defence in caſe of unjuſt perſecution eligion, he was bound to that Law as well ; *For he came not to deſtroy, but to fulfill the* both by his example and precepts. If then harge the Doctrine of Abſolut Submiſſion, utiſh and ſtupid, ſee you do not run into hemy, by charging that holy One fooliſh- or whatever he knew of the ſecret will of D, he was to follow his revealed will in ctions, whereby he might be a perfect Pat- to all his followers: for GODS revea- ill was his rule, as well as ours. But I dwel ong on things that are clear. As for your nces, they will ſerve you in no ſtead. For oming to *Jeruſalem* was a duty, all the males bound to appear three times a year before the

the LORD at *Jeruſalem*, at the three feſtivals
Paſsover being the firſt of them, *Deut.* 16.
this being a duty, our LORD was to perf
it, what ever hazard might follow. So we
S. Paul on a leſs obligation going to *Jeruſa*
notwithſtanding of the bonds were fore-tol
abide him there. And as for your other
tended conſequence againſt prayer, from
not praying for legions of Angels, it bew
great inadvertency: for you find our LO
a few minuts before, praying in the Gard
Matth. 26. 42. over and over again, that
were poſſible that cup might paſs from him.
there is our warrant from his practiſe, to
for a deliverance from troubles or perſecuti
if it may ſtand with the holy will of GO
But for a miraculous deliverance by the mini
ry of Angels, that our LORD would not
for, leſt thereby the Propheſies ſhould n
accompliſhed: and by this, our praying f
miraculous deliverance, is indeed from his
ample condemned: but ſtill we are to pray,
if it be poſſible, and according to the wi
GOD, any bitter cup is put in our hands,
paſs from us. Next, let me deſire you to
ſider the reaſon given *S. Peter* for putting u
ſword, *Matth.* 26. 52. *For they that tak*
ſword, ſhal periſh by the ſword.

Iſot. You miſapply this place palpably, it
b

designed as a threatning against *S. Peter*, or the encouragement of his Disciples, and indeed a Propheſie that the *Jews* who now against him with ſwords and ſtaves, ſhould by the ſword of the *Romans*, who ſhould ne avengers of CHRISTS death. *See* 25.

rit. You are beholding to *Grotius* for this ſition, who is the firſt of the latter Writers hath given that ſenſe to theſe words, though oucheth for his opinion ſome elder Writers; e deſigning to prove that a privat perſon reſiſt another privat aſſaillant by force, be- little pinched with this place, which ſeems ndemn ſimply the uſe of the ſword, eſcapes f it by the anſwer you have adduced. But gh this were the genuine ſcope of theſe ls, ſtill remember that our LORD re- the uſe of the ſword for his defence: and s fore-telling the deſtruction of the *Jews*, of force to bind up *S. Peters* hands, why d not alſo that general promiſe, *Rev.* 13.10. *hat killeth with the ſword, muſt be killed by the d*, alſo ſecure our fears, and ſheath our ds, and the rather that it is there ſubjoyned, *is the faith and patience of the Saints?* Which s to imply that ſince retaliation will be gi- out by GOD upon unjuſt murderers, efore faith & patience muſt be the exerciſe

of

of the Saints, which to all unprejudged min
will ſound a diſcharge of the uſe of weapons
war. But after all this, the phraſe of *taking*
ſword, ſeems only applicable to *S. Peter*; for
band being ſent out by a Magiſtrat, could
properly be ſaid to have taken the ſword, it
ing put in their hands by theſe who were in
ſted with it, though they now tyrannically ab
their power: but the phraſe agrees much b
ter with *S. Peter* his drawing it who had no w
rant for it, and ſo did indeed take it. Ne
we hear no mention of the band of ſoldi
their uſing their ſwords; therefore this pre
ction ſeems fitted for S. *Peter*, and all ſuch
miſtaking the nature of the Chriſtian diſpen
tion, do take the ſword. But next, conſi
CHRISTS words to *Pilat*, *John* 18. 36.
Kingdom is not of this world: if my Kingdom
of this world, then would my ſervants fight, th
ſhould not be delivered to the Jews; but now is
Kingdom not from hence. And this being
upon the accuſation the *Jews* had given aga
him to *Pilat*, that he called himſelf a King, c
ging him upon his friendſhip to *Ceſar*, to
him to death, CHRISTS anſwer ſhows
earthly Kings need apprehend no preju
from his Kingdom, ſince it not being ab
worldly things, was not to be fought for.

Iſot. Speak plainly, do you mean by

t CHRIST ſhould have no Kingdom
n earth? which I fear too many of you de-
, ſince you preſs this ſo warmly. But conſi-
you not that by this CHRIST only
ns he was not to ſet up a temporal Domi-
upon earth, to juſtle *Ceſar* from his Throne,
as the *Jews* expected from their *Meſſiah*;
therefore this place is indeed ſtrong againſt
pretences of ſome carnal fifth Monarchy
, but is ill adduced to condemn defence,
n we are unjuſtly aſſaulted by a perſecuting
ant. *See p.* 25.

rit. It is no new thing to find the ſincere
rine of the Goſpel miſrepreſented by ſons
Belial; but learn the difference betwixt a
gdom of the world, and in the world, and
mper your paſſion. CHRIST muſt have
ngdom in the world, but not of it. And the
teſt hazard of a pretending King being the
ng of wars and commotions upon his Title,
RISTS words are not truly commented
y the practiſe of his ſervants, unleſs they ſe-
Princes from their fears of their raiſing of
s upon his Title: Therefore as the fighting
hat time, for preſerving CHRIST from
Jews, had been contrary to the nature of his
itual Kingdom; ſo the rule of the Goſpel
ling all the ſucceeding ages of the Church,
eſs then theſe to whom it was firſt delivered,

what was then contrary to the nature
CHRISTS Kingdom, will be so still. A
to this I might add the doctrine of peace
much insisted on in the *New Testament*, it bei
the Legacy CHRIST left to his Disciple
which we are commanded *to follow with all m*
as much as is possible, and as in us lyes. And
with all men, sure much more with the Ma
strat. And *S. Pauls* words in the 13. to t
Romans are so express, that me thinks th
should strike a terror in all men from resisti
the Superior Powers, lest they *resist the ordina*
of GOD, and receive damnation. And it is o
servable that *S. Paul*, who as a zealot had f
merly persecuted the Christians, doth now
directly contradict that doctrine, which wa
that time so horridly corrupted among the *Je*
This place is so express, that it needs not the
vantages may be given to it, either from
consideration of the power the *Roman* Em
had usurped over the world, or from the E
peror who then reigned, who must have b
either *Claudius* or *Nero*: and if the former,
find, *Acts* 18. 2. that *he banished all the Jews f*
Rome, and with them the Christians, not be
distinguished by the *Romans* from the *Jews*, w
also banished: and here was a driving of C
stians from *Rome*, which you will not den
have been a persecution. But if it was N

know very well how the Christians were
d by him. But these words of *S. Paul* being
t first addressed to the *Romans*, so also desig-
by the holy Ghost to be a part of the rule of
Christians, do prove, that whoever hath the
ream Power, is to be submitted to, and ne-
resisted.

Sot. If you were not in too great a haste,
would not be so forward, consider there-
the reason *S. Paul* gives for submission to
erior Rulers, is, *because they are the Ministers*
GOD for good: If then they swerve from
, they forsake the end for which they are
d up, and so fall from their power and right
ur obedience.

Basil. Truly what you have said makes me
repent of any haste I seemed to make; for
t you have alledged proves indeed that the
eraign is a Minister of GOD for good, so
he corrupts his power grosly when he pur-
not that design: but in that he is only ac-
table to GOD, whose Minister he is.
this must hold good, except you give us
d ground to believe that GOD hath gi-
authority to the subjects to call him to ac-
t for his trust; but if that be not made ap-
, then he must be left to GOD, who did
wer him, and therefore can only coërce
As one having his power from a King,

is countable to none for the administration
it, but to the King, or to these on whom t
King shal devolve it: so except it be prove
that *GOD* hath warranted subjects to c
their Soveraigns to account, they being his M
nisters, must only be answerable to him. A
according to these principles of yours, the M
gistrats authority shal be so enervated, that
shal no more be able to serve these designs, f
which GOD hath vested him with powe
every one being thus taught to shake off
yoak when they think he acts in prejudice
Religion. And here I shal add one thing whi
all *Casuists* hold a safe rule in matters that
doubtful, that we ought to follow that side
the doubt which is freest of hazard; here th
damnation is at least the seeming hazard of r
stance; therefore except upon as clear evide
you prove the danger of absolute submissio
be of the same nature that it may ballance
other; then absolute submissiòn, as being
secures̄t, is to be followed. Next, we
S. Peter, 1. *Pet.* 2. 13. *&c.* who being yet i
cted with the spirit of a *Jewish* zealot, had dr
the sword; afterwards when indued with po
from on High, at length pressing the doct
of obedience, adding that the pretence of
Christian freedom should not be made a cl
of maliciousnes. And this submission he
c

mends not only to ſubjects, whoſe obe-
ce was more eaſie, but to ſervants who were
er a heavier yoak, according to the laws of
itude, both among the *Jews* and the *Romans*:
he tells them, That *when they did well, and*
red for it, and took it patiently, that was accep-
e. Withall adding, *For even hereunto were you*
d; becauſe CHRIST alſo ſuffered for us,
ng us an example, that we ſhould follow his
. Further, it is to be conſidered how the
did upon the firſt preaching of the Goſpel
ecute the Chriſtians every where: *S. Stephen*
ſtoned, and *Saul* got commiſſions for ma-
havock of the Church: but becauſe this
done by the authority of the *Sanhedrim*, no
tance was made them, though ſince at two
ions we hear of 8000. converts, we may be
ced to believe their number was great. And
hence ſubſume that the caſe of perſecu-
being then not only imminent, but alſo pre-
(beſides the grievous perſecutions were
ing the Churches for three Centuries) it
be confeſſed to be ſtrange, that the matter
ſiſtance being at leaſt ſo dubious, no deci-
ſhould be given about it in the *New Teſta-*
; nothing being alledged from it that hath
aſpect that way. And indeed I cannot con-
my wonder at them who plead ſo much the
ority aud fulneſs of Scripture, to reach even

the rituals of worſhip and Government, an
yet in ſo great a matter adventure on a practi
without its warrant. Truly *Iſotimus*, if the
things prevail not with you, beyond your litt
ſmal ſhufflings, I doubt it is becauſe you have lo
the ſtandard to meaſure reaſon by, and have g
ven up your judgement to your paſſions and i
tereſts.

Iſot. I am far from denying the doctrine
the Croſs to be a great part of theſe duties
are bound to in the Goſpel; but this muſt not
ſtretched too far, leſt it infer an obligation
us to ſubmit to a forreign Prince, the *Turk*,
any other, if he come by force to impoſe on
the *Alcoran*, under a pretence of ſuffering
Religion. *See pag.* 27. *and* 28.

Baſil. Truly when I hear how much wei
is laid on what you have now ſaid, as if it amo
ted to a demonſtration againſt all hath been
therto adduced, I am in doubt whither to p
their weakneſs, or blame their perverſneſs, w
dare adventure on that, the puniſhment whe
the holy Ghoſt hath made damnation, upon ſ
miſtakes: for GOD hath put the ſwor
their hands who have the Soveraign Pow
which they bear not in vain; for they *are the*
niſters of GOD, and his revengers, to
cute wrath on him that doth evil: The Magiſt
then are both by the Laws of GOD, and o
Nati

ions, the Protectors of their ſubjects, and efore tributs & cuſtoms are due to them, for aying the expence to which that muſt put n; and prayers are to be offered up for them, *we may lead a quyet & peaceable life in all godli- and honeſty.* If then a forreign Prince invade untrey, under whatever pretence, the Sove- n is bound to defend his ſubjects, with the d GOD hath put in his hand, which es to be a moſt lawful war on his ſide; nay , as he were a betrayer of his truſt, if he ted it.

ot. But what if our Prince ſhould conſent ch an invaſion, and expoſe his ſubjects to be ey to ſuch an Invader, muſt they look on ſee themſelves deſtroyed, upon the pre- e that GOD hath not put the ſword in hands, and therefore they muſt not take it; becauſe CHRISTS Kingdom is not of this ld, therefore they muſt not fight for him?

aſil. You ſuppoſe a caſe not like to fall out ſte; but were it real, that Invader having no e to that peoples obedience, they may make of that right of Nature which allows to one of a Society forcible ſelf-defence, if violent- ſſaulted: and therefore ſuch hoſtile inva- , be it upon what pretence ſoever, may be wfully reſiſted, as one privat man may reſiſt her in his own defence, if he threaten to kill

him, unleſs he renounce GOD. If then on
man may reſiſt another, ſo may more men reſi
a great force coming againſt them: for to u
who live here, the *Grand Seignior* is but a fello
of our nature, and hath no right over us, n
more then one privat perſon hath over h
neighbor. And if you do not acknowledge
great difference betwixt ſuch an aſſerting of ou
Liberties, from one that hath no Title to them
and the reſiſting of a lawful Magiſtrat, thoug
unjuſtly perſecuting his ſubjects, you muſt b
ſet to your horned book again.

Iſot. But at leaſt you will confeſs that priv
men living in a ſettled Society, have no title t
the ſword, according to your principles; mu
we then yeeld our throats to a robber that a
faults us on the high-way? Or to come near
you, if one threaten to kill us, if we yeeld no
to their Religion, muſt we give way to the
fury?

Baſil. Remember ſtill how I told you, th
men living out of Societies have a right to ſel
defence, and when they come under Societie
they retain all their former rights, ſuch only ex
cepted as are by the laws of the Society judge
inconſiſtent with its order and peace: therefo
reſiſting of the Supream Powers, or thoſe hi
ving their authority, being only diſcharged, th
right of ſelf-defence againſt equals ſtill remai
intir

re, ſo that a privat perſon may claim it or , as he will: and therefore in the caſe of n an aggreſſor, the Laws of Nature and Na- ns do warrant me to uſe force when aſſaulted; if a greater conſideration appear, and it be dent that my giving way to ſuch unjuſt force l be more for the honor of the Goſpel, if I ſt, I do not ſin, but do well; but if I reſiſt not, tainly I do better.

End. I have been a witneſs to this diſcourſe, without much pleaſure, and do acknow- ge my ſelf fully convinced of the neceſſity of dience, and ſubmiſſion to the Supream Po- , ſince without that be once eſtabliſhed, as foundation of Societies, I ſee not what peace rder can be looked for, but every one will e on him to judge the Law-giver: and if he e ſo much power or policy as to make a par- he will never want pretences, chiefly about ligion, conſidering in how many various opi- ns the Chriſtian world hath divided about it. d it is a poor anſwer to ſay, it muſt be the e Religion that we ſhould defend, ſince it is be ſuppoſed every one judgeth the Religion is of to be the true one: If then according hat doctrine, Religion be to be defended; tainly though the Religion be wrong, yet ry one oppreſſed in his conſcience, and jud- g it to be according to truth, is bound to defend

defend it; since even an erring conscience do
at least ty, if not oblige. For the common r
solution of *Casuists* being that a man under
erroneous conscience, is yet to follow its dicta
though he sin by so doing: then all parties th
are oppressed, ought to vindicat what th
judge to be the truth of GOD. And by t
you may see to what a fair pass the peace of ma
kind is brought by these opinions.

But mistake me not, as I were here pleadi
for submission, to patronize the tyranny
cruelty of persecuting Princes, who shal answ
to GOD for that great trust depositated
their hands; which if they transgress, they ha
a dear account to make to him *who sits in hea*
and laughs at the raging and consultings of th
Kings or Princes, who design to throw off his yoak,
burst his bonds in sunder. He who hath set his K
upon his holy Hill of Zion, shal rule them with a
of iron, and break them in pieces as a potters ves
And he to whom vengeance doth belong, w
avenge himself of all the injuries they do h
truths, or followers: but as they sin against hi
so they are only countable to him.

Yet I need not add what hath been often sai
that it is not the name of a King, or the cerem
nies of a Coronation, that cloathes one with t
Soveraign Power; since I know there are, a
have been titular Kings, who are indeed but t
fi

Perſons of the State, and only Adminiſtra-
of the Laws, the Soveraign Power lying in
Aſſembly of the Nobility, and States, to
m they are accountable. In which caſe,
Court to whom theſe Kings muſt give ac-
t, is the Supream Judicatory of the King-
, and the King is but a ſubject.

ot. But doth not the Coronation of a King,
ther with his oath given, and the conſent
e people demanded at it, prove him to have
ower upon the conditions in that oath?
theſe oathes being mutually given, his Co-
tion oath firſt, and the oath of Allegiance
, do ſhow it is a compact; and in all mutual
ements, the nature of compacts is, that the
party breaking, the other is alſo free. Fur-
, Kings who are tyed up, ſo that they can-
make, nor repeal Laws, nor impoſe taxes
out the conſent of the States of their King-
n, ſhow their power to be limited, and that
aſt ſuch Aſſemblies of the States ſhare with
m in the Soveraign Power, which is at large
le out by *Jus populi.*

Baſil. It is certain there cannot be two coor-
at Powers in a Kingdom; for no man can
ve two Maſters: therefore ſuch an Aſſembly
he States muſt either be Soveraign or ſub-
; for a middle there is not. As for the Co-
ation of Princes, it is like enough that at
firſt

first it was the formal giving of their powe
them; and the old ceremonies yet obſerved i
prove it hath been at firſt ſo among us: Bu
being a thing clear in our Law, that the K
never dies, his Heir coming in his place in
very moment he expires, ſo that he is to
obeyed before his Coronation, as well as af
and that the Coronation is nothing but the
lemn inaugurating in the authority which
King poſſeſſed from his fathers death, ſho
that any ceremonies may be uſed in it, whate
the original of them may have been, do not f
ject his title to the Crown to the peoples c
ſent. And therefore his oath of Coronatio
not the condition upon which he gets his
wer, ſince he poſſeſſed that before; nor is it up
that title that he exacts the oath of Allegian
which he likewiſe exacted before his Coro
tion. This being the practiſe of a Kingd
paſſed all preſcription, proves the Coronat
to be no compact betwixt the King and his f
jects: And therefore he is indeed bound by
Coronation oath to GOD, who will be av
ged on him, if he break it, ſo the matter o
were lawful: but the breaking of it cannot f
feit a prior right he had to the peoples o
dience. And as for the limitations Kings h
conſented to paſs on their own power, that t
may act nothing but in ſuch a form of Law, th
be

either the Kings free conceſſions to the
le, or reſtraints ariſing from ſome rebel-
which extorted ſuch priviledges, will ne-
rove the King a ſubject to ſuch a Court,
s by the clear Laws and practiſes of that
dom, it be ſo provided, that if he do mal-
, he may be puniſhed; which when made
ar, proves that Court to have the Soveraign
r: and that never weakens my deſign, that
cts ought not to reſiſt their Soveraign.

hilar. You have dwelt, me thinks, too
on this, though conſidering the nature of
ning, it deſerves indeed an exact diſcuſſion:
his whole doctrine appears ſo clear to a diſ-
ng mind, that I cannot imagine whence all
niſt is raiſed about it can ſpring, except
the corrupt paſſions or luſts of men, which
ubtil enough to invent excuſes, and fair co-
for the blackeſt of crimes. And the ſmoak
e bottomleſs pit may have its ſhare, in oc-
ning the darkneſs is raiſed about that,
h by the help of the light of GOD, or of
n, ſtands ſo clear and obvious. But when
ſider the inſtances of ſufferings under both
enſations, I cannot ſee how any ſhould
e the force of ſo much evident proof as
s about this opinion. And if it had been
eoples duty to have reformed by the force
rms under the Old Diſpenſation, ſo that it

was

was a baſe and ſervile complyance with the
ranny and idolatry of their Kings, not to h
reſiſted their ſubverting of Religion, and
ting up of Idolatry, where was then the fide
of the Prophets, who were *to lift up their vo*
as Trumpets, and to ſhow the houſe of Jacob
iniquities? And ſince the watch-man who g
not warning to the wicked from his wic
way, was guilty of his blood, I ſee not what
excuſe the ſilence of the Prophets in this,
was the peoples duty to reform: For it is a p
refuge to ſay, becauſe the people were ſo m
inclined to Idolatry, that therefore it was in
to exhort them to reform; *(See p.* 10. 11.) ſ
by that argument you may as well conclud i
have been needleſs to have exhorted their Ki
to Reformation, their inclination to Idol
being ſo ſtrong: but their duty was to be
charged, how ſmal ſoever the likelyhood
of the peoples yeelding obedience to their
nings. If then it was the peoples duty to
form, the omiſſion of it was undoubtedly a
how then comes it that they who had it in cõ
ſion to *cauſe Jeruſalem to know her abominat*
under ſo ſevere a certificat, do never charge
people for not going about a popular Refor
tion, nor coërcing theſe wicked Kings who
&ted ſo much Idolatry, backing it with ſuch t
ny, nor ever require them to ſet about it? I kn

ath pickt out some expressions (*See answer letter to the Author of Jus populi*) which to houghts sound that way: but truly they o remote from the sense he stretches them hat I should wonder much at his Glosses, not know that the Bell seems often to ring earers fancy. From these, let us pass to nstances of the first Christians, who endu- he sharpest persecutions with the greatest nce.

olyb. Here is a large Theam for much dis- se, if I should adduce all might be said on ead. Indeed the persecutions the Chri- groaned under for three hundred years, uch, that scarce can they be read without or; the last especially, which continued for t twenty years under *Diocletian*, and his eagues and Successors; and by the number suffered, we may easily gues what the gth of the Christians was. But this can oubted by none who have ever looked upon ory. *Pliny lib.* 10. *Ep.* 97. writes to *Trajan* ch is reckoned to have been the 104. year CHRIST) that in *Pontus* and *Bithynia*; re he was then Proconsul, there were many stians of all ages, ranks and sexes: and that nly in the Cities, but through the Villages Countrey places, that the Temples were al- desolat, the sacrifices long intermitted,

and

and that none almoſt were found to buy the ſtims. The number of the Chriſtians being early riſen to that hight, we may eaſily imag to what it ſwelled before *Conſtantines* tim not long after that, we find a whole Leg of *Marcus Aurelius* his army to have b Chriſtians. And if we believe *Tertullian*, th numbers were formidable in his time; for a he had purged the Chriſtians of his times fr the deſigns of doing miſchief to their enem by ſtealth, he adds, *Apol. cap.* 37. *Should we c towards you not as ſecret avengers, but as open mies, would we want the ſtrength of numbers an mies? Are the Maurs, the Marcoman the Parthians themſelves, or any Nations ſhu within their own Countrey or bounds, more the whole world? We are ſtrangers to you, and y fill all your places, your Towns, your Iſlands, Caſtles, your Villages, your Councils, your Ca your Tribes, your Decuries, your Palaces, you nat, and your Market place: Only we come n your Temples, but abandon thoſe to you. To war had we not been both fit and ready, even th our forces had been fewer, who are butchered ſo lingly, if our diſcipline did not allow us rather killed then to kill?* And he goes on, telling *ſuch was the number of the Chriſtians, that w they but change their dwellings, and leave the R Empire, it would have thereby become an am*

ſoli

de, since almost all their Citizens were Chri-
s. And the same Writer saith elsewhere, *ad*
. cap. 2. That *though the Romans who were Ido-*
s, were found guilty of many conspiracies against
Emperors, yet never were any Christians found
y of these practises. And adds, That *a Chri-*
was no mans enemy, much less the Emperors;
nowing him to be constituted by GOD, he doth
imself bound to love, reverence, honor, and wish
o him, with the whole Roman Empire, as long
world lasts. Therefore, saith he, *We wor-*
he Emperor so as befits him, and is lawful for
s a man next GOD, who hath obtained all he
from GOD, and is inferior to none, but GOD
And a little after, *Cap.* 5. he tells us of
umbers of the Christians, *and how undaun-*
ey were at the persecution; so that when one Ar-
Antoninus in Asia, was persecuting the Chri-
, the whole City run to his Tribunal declaring
elves Christians. And he adds, *If the like*
to be done at Carthage, what would become of
e thousands were there, of every sex, age and
? From this we may guess both of the
gth and numbers of the Christians of that
, and yet there was not the least inclination
g them to resistance. If any doubt the truth
hat *Tertullian* saith, as is *p.* 30. he must charge
with very much impudence, who durst of-
ch writings to the *Heathens*, in matters of

fact, which could not but be notoriously enou
known: Neither do I adduce these places, b
cause I lay so much weight on *Tertullians* o
nion in this matter, as because he shows us w
was the sense of the Christians of his time.
little after him *Cyprian* lived, who also tells
ad Demetrianum, *That none of the Christians w*
apprehended, struggled with those who sei
on them, nor avenged themselves of that u
stice, though their number was great and copio
But their belief of the vengeance should follow
their persecutors, made them patient, so t
the innocent yeelded to the guilty. And we m
judge of the number of the Christians of t
age, by what *Cornelius* who was Bishop of *Ro*
Anno 254. *in Euseb.* 6. *Book, cap.* 43. tells
the State of the *Roman Clergy* in his time, h
there were in it 46. Presbyters, 7. Deacons,
Acolyths, 52. Exorcists, Lectors and Porte
and of widows and poor persons 1500.
where so many poor were maintained, you m
confess the number of the Christians was v
great. But if we go to *Diocletians* time,
find the number of the Christians incredib
and the cruelties used against them to have b
such, that Hell could devise nothing beyo
them. Some were burnt alive, others had b
ling lead powred on them, others had their
and joynts torn off them by burning pinc
oth

ers were broken to pieces, others ſtretched
ut of joynt, others hanged up by the thumbs
cut in ſlyces, others hanged up by the heels.
this was univerſal through the whole Em-
, and to ſuch a degree, that it continued for
y years; and in *Egypt* alone they were of-
killed by hundreds a day, as *Euſebius* tells,
was a witneſs to much of it. And *Godean*
ons, that in one moneth there were ſeven-
thouſand Martyrs killed: and during that
ecution in the Province of *Egypt*, there were
ndred forty and four thouſand, who died
e violence of their perſecutors, and ſeven
red thouſand who died through the fa-
es of baniſhment, or of the publick works,
hich they were condemned. I had almoſt
ot one ſort of perſecution, which as it was
oſt dreaded, ſo hath in it that which could
ut provoke all to the utmoſt of horror and
air, which was the proſtituting of their Vir-
more dreaded then any death. But among
eſe vaſt numbers, none offered to reſiſt with
word: & yet they were ſo marvelouſly aſſi-
by GOD, that in their ſufferings they ex-
ed the greateſt joy in GOD, by their hymns
ſalms, and the moſt of mildneſs to their
ecutors. And dare you ſay, *Iſotimus*, that
were a ſtupid ſelf-murdering crew? Or
ou think that had they been guilty of ſuch

a crime, as you ſeem to faſten on the doctrine
abſolut ſubmiſſion, GOD had appeared
them in ſuch a ſignal manner, to the convict
and horror of their perſecutors?

I confeſs there is no piece of Story I r
with ſuch pleaſure as the accounts are give
theſe Martyrs: for me thinks they leave a
vor upon my mind, which I meet with in
ſtudy, that of the Scriptures being only exc
ted. Say not then they were not able to h
ſtood to their own defence, when it appe
how great their numbers were: Or ſhal I h
tell you the known Story of the *Thebean Le*
which conſiſted of 6666. who being by *M*
minus Herculeus, *an.* 287. preſſed in the
they gave the Emperor to ſwear upon the a
of the Idols, withdrew from the Camp e
miles off; and when he ſent to invite the
come and ſwear as the others had done; t
who commanded them anſwered in all t
names, *That they were ready to return and*
ſtoutly againſt the Barbarians; but that being
ſtians, they would never worſhip the Gods. Wh
upon the Emperor cauſed tyth them, which t
received with ſuch joy, that every one de
the lot might fall on himſelf. And this pre
ling nothing on them, he tythed them a ſec
time; and that being alſo without effect, he
ſed murder them all, to which they ſubmi

out reſiſtance. And it is not to be denyed, ch a number being driven to ſuch deſpair, aving ſo much courage as to dare to die in blood, might have ſtood to their defence a while, and at leaſt ſold their lives at a dear eſpecially they having got off eight miles the army.

ere it my deſign to back theſe inſtances the great authorities of the moſt eminent ers of the Church in theſe times, I ſhould too tedious: but this is ſo far from being ed, that the only way to eſcape ſo ſtrong an t, is to ſtudy to detract from theſe holy by enquiring into any over-reachings, to n their fervor might have engaged them.

t. All their practiſes are not binding upon or many of them did precipitat themſelves azards, others were againſt flight, & others ſt reſiſting of privat aſſailants, who without nt came to murder them; therefore the ſpi- at acted in them, though it produced effects y to the honor of the Goſpel, is not to be ted by us: yet on the other hand, I acknow- we ought to be ſlow to judge them. One is obſervable, that *Maximinus* was reſi- by the *Armenians*, when he intended to ſet olatry among them. *Conſtantin* alſo inva- *Licinius* when he perſecuted the Chriſtians *East*: And the *Perſians*, when perſecuted

by their King, implored the help of the *Roma* Emperor. Beſides, I have ſeen a Catalogue o many inſtances of reſiſtance uſed in ſome Citie when their good Biſhops were forced awa from them, which ſhows they were not ſo ſt pid as you deſign to repreſent them. *See pa* 29. *&c. and Jus populi at length.*

Baſil. It is certain all Chriſtians have o law and rule; and the laws of nature are eter and irreverſible: if then the Law of Nature e gage us to ſelf-defence, it laid the ſame tyes o them: therefore except you turn *Enthuſiaſ* you muſt ſay, that what is a duty, or a ſin no was ſo then likewiſe; and ſo you muſt eith charge that cloud of witneſſes with brutiſh ſt pidity, otherwiſe accuſe our late forwardneſs unjuſt reſiſtance, ſince one rule was given both; and contradicting practiſes can never adjuſted to the ſame rule. As for theſe in dious aſperſions you would faſten on them, a they had not underſtood their own liberti they are but poor eſcapes; for it being alrea made out that violent reſiſtance even of an equ is not a law, but a right of Nature; if th thought it more for the glory of the Goſpel yeeld even to privat injuries, who are we to them for it? But for flying from the perſe tors, it is true *Tertullian* condemned it, but t was neither the opinion nor practiſe of the Ch ſtians in theſe ages.

As for what you alledge about the resistance
de by the *Armenians* to *Maximinus*, I wish
r friend had vouched his Author for what
faith of them; for I am confident he is not so
oudent as to prove a matter of fact done
lve ages ago, by a Writer of this age. All I
meet with about that, is from *Eusebius lib.* 9.
. 6. who tells, *That in these times the Tyrant*
de war against the Armenians (men that had
of old friends and auxiliaries to the Romans)
m because they were Christians, and were pious,
ealously studious about divine matters, that hater
GOD intending to force to worship the false Gods
Devils, made to become enemies in stead of
ds, and adversaries in stead of auxiliaries. And
he beginning of the next Chapter, he tells
v in that war he and his army received a
at defeat. Now how you will inferr from
, that subjects may resist their Soveraign for
ligion, I see not: for these *Armenians* were
Confederats, and not his subjects: and it is
r by the account *Eusebius* gives, that *Arme-*
was not a Province, nor governed by a Pre-
, as were the Provinces. Besides, consider
w *Maximinus* came in the fag-end of that
at persecution begun by *Diocletian* and *Her-*
us, continued by *Galerius*, and consumma-
by *Maximinus* himself, in which for all
numbers of the Martyrs, and the cruelty of

the perſecution, there was not ſo much as a
mult: which makes it evident the Chriſt
at that time underſtood not the doctrine of
ſiſtance. But the *Armenians* caſe varying fr
that of ſubjects, it was free for them to reſi
unjuſt Invader, who had no title to their o
dience.

For your Story of *Licinius*, the true acco
of it will clear miſtakes beſt (*as it is given by E*
10.*cap.*5.) *Conſtantine* after he turned Chriſt
being then Emperor of the *Weſt*, called for *L*
nius, whom *Galerius* had made Emperor in
East, and they both from *Millain* gave
Edicts in favor of the Chriſtians, giving th
abſolut liberty, and diſcharging all perſecu
on that account, which is reckoned to have b
in the year 313. afterwards he allied with *L*
nius, and gave him his ſiſter in marriage, and
knowledged him his Collegue in the Emp
But ſome years after that wars aroſe betw
them, which *Zoſimus* & *Eutropius* impute to C
ſtantins ambition, & impatience of a rival: bu
we believe the account *Euſebius* gives of it, *L*
nius provoked with envy at *Conſtantine*, and f
getting the laws of Nature, the bonds of oat
alliance, and agreement, raiſed a peſtiferous
cruel war againſt him, and laid many deſi
and ſnares for his deſtruction, which he atte
ted long by ſecret and fraudulent wayes,
th

were always by GODS providence diſ-
ed, and ſo *Conſtantine* eſcaped all his deſig-
niſchief: At length *Licinius* finding his ſe-
rts did not ſucceed, he openly made war
ſt *Conſtantine*. And as he was preparing
, he made war likewiſe againſt GOD, and
cuted the Chriſtians, becauſe he apprehen-
hey all prayed for *Conſtantine*, and wiſhed
ſucceſs; whereupon he made ſevere laws
ſt the Chriſtians, forbidding the Biſhops
o meet among themſelves, or to inſtruct
omen: afterwards he baniſhed all that
d not worſhip the Gods, and from that he
to an open perſecution; and not content
that, he by ſevere laws diſcharged any to
nd relieve ſuch as were in priſon for the
Yet notwithſtanding of all this, none
ere under his part of the Empire did reſiſt
nay, not ſo much as turn over to *Conſtantine*
ſt him, for ought that appears: But upon
things a war followed betwixt *Conſtantine*
im, wherein *Licinius* was defeated, and for-
o ſubmit to what conditions *Conſtantine* was
ed to give: who took from him *Greece* and
um, and only left him *Thrace*, and the *Eaſt*.
Licinius returning to his old ways, and brea-
all agreements, a ſecond war followed,
ein *Licinius* was utterly defeated, and ſent
d a privat life at *Theſſalonica*, where he was
ſome-

ſometime after that killed, becauſe of new
ſigns againſt *Conſtantine*. This being the
account of that Story, I am to divine wha
vantage it can yeeld to the cauſe of ſubjects
ſting their Soveraign; for here was a ſupe
Prince defending himſelf againſt the unju
tempts, and hoſtile incurſions of his enemy;
was alſo inferior to him, as *Euſebius* ſtate
whom conſult 10. *Book*, 8. *ch. and* 1. *Book of*
life, *ch.* 42. *and* 2. *Book*, *ch.* 2. *&c.*

And for your inſtance of the *Perſians* im
ring the aid of the *Romans*, I am afraid it
ſerve you in as little ſtead: for the accoun
crates gives of it (*lib.* 7. *cap.* 18.) is, that *B*
tanes King of *Perſia*, did ſeverely perſecut
Chriſtians, whereupon the Chriſtians that d
in *Perſia*, were neceſſitated to fly to the *Ro*
and beſeech them not to neglect them who
ſo deſtroyed, they were kindly received by
cus the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, who bent al
care and thoughts for their aid, and made
matter known to *Theodoſius* the ſecond then
peror: but it happened at that time the *Ro*
had a quarrel with the *Perſians*, who had h
a great many *Romans* that wrought in Mi
and ſent them back without paying the ag
hire; which quarrel was much hightned by
Perſian Chriſtians complaint; for the Kin
Perſia ſent Ambaſſadors to remand them

es: but the *Romans* refuſed to reſtore
and not only gave them Sanctuary, but
d by all their power to defend the Chri-
eligion, and rather make war with the
s, then ſee the Chriſtians ſo deſtroyed.
t will be a pretty ſlight of *Logick*, if from
s flying from a perſecution, and ſeeking
under another Prince, you will infer that
ay reſiſt their own King. And for *Theo-*
is war, we ſee other grounds aſſigned by
ſtorian: and the Politicks even of good
s in their making of wars, muſt not be a
our conſciences: neither know I why
ſtance is adduced, except it be to juſtifie
who are ſaid (during the wars betwixt
own Soveraign and the Countrey where
ived) to have openly prayed for victory
their Countrey, and to have correſpon-
oppoſition to their native Soveraign.

I muſt next diſcuſs that Catalogue of tu-
in the fourth and fifth Century, which are
ht as precedents for the reſiſting of ſub-
and here I muſt mind you of the great
e was in Chriſtendom after *Conſtantines*
before whom none were Chriſtians, but
s were perſwaded of the truth of the Go-
and were ready to ſuffer for its profeſſion;
it being then a doctrine objected to many
utions, few are to be ſuppoſed to have
entred

entred into its diſcipline without ſome co
ctions about it in their conſciences: but the c
varied much after the Emperors became Ch
ſtian; ſo that what by the ſeverity of their law
what by the authority of their example, alm
all the world rendered themſelves Chriſtia
which did let in ſuch a ſwarm of corrupt men
to the Chriſtian Societies, that the face of the
was quickly much changed, and both Cler
and Laity became very corrupt, as appears fr
the complaints of all the Writers of the four
Century: what wonder then if a tumultuati
humor crept into ſuch a mixed multitude? A
indeed moſt of theſe inſtances which are alle
ged, if they be adduced to prove the corrupti
of that time, they conclud but too well: B
alace! will they have the authority of prec
dents, or can they be looked upon as the ſen
of the Church at that time, ſince they are n
ther approven by Council or Church-Write
And truly the tumults in theſe times were t
frequent upon various occaſions; but upon no
more then the popular elections of Biſhops,
which *Nazianzen* gives diverſe inſtances, a
for which they were taken from the people
the Council of *Laodicea*, *Can.* 13. It is a
well enough known how theſe tumults flow
more from the tumultuary temper of the pe
ple, then from any doctrine their Teache

infuse in them. And therefore *Socrates lib.* p. 13. giving account of one of the tumults *Alexandria* (made use of by your friends, as cedent) tells how that City was ever incli- to tumults, which were never compesced out blood. And at that time differences ng in betwixt *Orestes* the Prefect, and *Cyril* Bishop, who was the first that turned the sthood unto a temporal dominion, they had y debates: for *Orestes* hating the power of Bishops, which he judged detracted from Prefects authority, did much oppose *Cyril*; *Cyril* having raised a tumult against the *Jews*, rein some of them were killed, and the rest hem driven out of the City, *Orestes* was so leased at that, that he refused to be recon- d with him; whereupon 500. Monks came n from *Nitria* to fight for their Bishop, who n the Prefect, and one of them named *Am- us*, wounded him in the head with a stone; the people gathering they all fled, only *Am- ius* was taken, whom the Prefect tortured he died; but *Cyril* buried him in the Church, magnified his fortitude to the degree of oning him a Martyr, of which he was after- ds ashamed. And there being in *Alexan-* at that time a learned and famous Lady, cal- *Hyppatia*, whom the people suspected of in- ning the Prefect against the Bishop, they led

on

on by a Reader of the Church, set on her, dragged her from her Chariot into a Chur and stript her naked, and most cruelly tore body to pieces, which they burnt to ashes. this, saith the Historian, *brought no smal infa both on Cyril, and on the Church of Alexandria, all who profess the Christian Religion, should be str gers to killing, fightings, and such like.* Truly, he that will found the doctrine of resistance such grounds, hath a mind on very easie ter to run himself upon condemnation. And such like are the warrants your friends br from Church History. Therefore I see th is yet good ground to assert that doctrine unknown in the Christian Church, till the ti wherein the Popes pretended to the tempo power over Princes: all whose plea was ma ged upon the grounds of the great importa of Religion to be preferred to all humane in rests, and that CHRIST had told his Di ples *to buy a sword*; and that Princes being Ministers of GOD, were to be no longer knowledged, then they observed that design which they were set up. Only in one parti lar, less disorder may be apprehended from pretensions of the *Roman* Bishops, then fr these maximes that put the power of judgi and controling the Magistrat in the peop hands, which opens a door to endless confusio

indeed ſets every privat perſon on the
one, and introduceth an Anarchy, which
never admit of order or remedy; whereas
e who had but one pretender over them,
d more eaſily deal with him, and more vi-
uſly reſiſt him.

ot. You have ſaid very many things from
ory, which I ſhal not at this time undertake
amine: but I am ſure it hath heen both the
tiſe and doctrine of the Reformed Chur-
, that in caſe of unjuſt Tyranny, the States
Kingdom may put a ſtop to the fury of a
: and therefore where the Reformation
ppoſed by cruelty, it was alſo defended by
. And let me add, that I believe your great
rel at this doctrine, is, becauſe the practiſe
was ſo great a mean of preſerving the Re-
ation, which though, in good manners,
muſt commend, yet I am afraid you hate it
ur heart.

hilar. Whither you or we be greater friends
e Reformation, let the world judge by this
ndication, that you ſtudy to draw all can be
ſed for the ſtaining it with blood, which is
onſtant calumny of its adverſaries, whereas
ffer with the cleareſt evidences to evince its
cence. But let me premiſe the diſtinction
octrine from practiſes; and though ſome un-
fiable practiſes appear, theſe muſt never
be

be charged on the Reformed Churches, un
it be made appear they were founded on t
doctrine. Beſides, the Reformers coming
of the corruptions of Popery, in which the
ctrine and practiſe of reſiſtance upon preten
of Religion were triumphant, it will not
found ſtrange though ſome of that ill tempe
zeal continued ſtill to leaven them. But
their doctrine, I take the ſtandart of it to b
the Confeſſions of the ſeveral Churches;
which being gathered in one harmony, we
in the right ſent of their opinions, when
ſearch for them there. Now the doctrine
reſiſting of Magiſtrats is by diverſe of their C
feſſions expreſly condemned, but in none
them aſſerted.

It is true there are ſome ambiguous exp
ſions in our *Scots* Confeſſion, regiſtred in Pa
ment *Anno* 1567. for *Art.* 14. among the tr
greſſions of the ſecond Table, they reck
diſobey or reſiſt any that GOD hath placed in
thority, while they paſs not over the bounds of their
fice; which ſeems to imply the lawfulneſs of
ſiſtance when they ſo tranſgreſs: but be
that it is not clearly aſſerted, and only in
red, this doth not determine what the *boun*
the Magiſtrats Office are: And if it be fo
that his Office is to coërce with the ſword,
to be accountable to none but to GOD, t

reſiſtance will follow from hence, except
limited Magiſtrat who is accountable to
ers. The ſame explication is to be given
hat part of the 24. *Art.* where all ſuch are
demned who *reſiſt the Supream Power, doing
thing which appertaineth to his charge.* But in
ſame Article the Magiſtrat is called *GODS
tenant, in whoſe Seſſions GOD himſelf doth
d judge.* But with this, it is to be conſide-
when that Confeſſion was ratified in Parlia-
t, even when no Soveraign was to look to
clearing of any ambiguities, which might
been upon deſign by ſome, and through
neglect of others, let paſs. The Confeſ-
of the other Churches are unexceptiona-
lain, and without reſtriction in the point
bjection: For what ſeems like a reſtriction
e *French* Confeſſion *(that the yoak of ſubje-
is willingly to be born, though the Magiſtrats
infidels, provided that GODS Soveraign au-
y remain entire and uncorrupted)* imports no-
, but that our ſubjection to them, which
s in both obedience and ſuffering, is not to
e out the great dominion GOD hath
our ſouls, whom we ſhould obey rather
man. And even the Confeſſion of the Aſ-
ly of Divines, ratified by the *Scots General
nbly*, ſpeaks of ſubmiſſion to Authority in ab-
termes, without the exception of reſiſtance

in case of Tyranny, *Cap.* 23. *art.* 4. *It is the* [illegible] *of people ------ to be subject to their authority for* [illegible] *science sake. Infidelity or difference in Religion,* [illegible] *not make void the Magistrats just and legal* [illegible] *rity, nor free the people from their due obedience to* [illegible] If then the doctrine of resistance be to be ow[illegible] as a law of Nature, and as a part of the Chris[illegible] freedom, how came it that it was not more [illegible] presly owned in this Confession, especially s[illegible] it is known to have been the opinion of mo[illegible] both these Assemblies? But on the contr[illegible] it seems condemned, and only the undiscer[illegible] reserves of *just*, *legal*, and *due*, are slipt in[illegible] the defence of their actings. Truly this s[illegible] not fair dealing, and such an asserting of su[illegible] ction at that time, looks either like the forc[illegible] truth extorting it, or intimats them afraid[illegible] ashamed to have owned that as their doctri[illegible] the world. And by this time, I suppose [illegible] clear that the Reformed Churches ought[illegible] to be charged with the doctrine of resistanc[illegible]

Poly. Nay, nor the Reformed Writers [illegible] ther, with whose words I could fill much pa[illegible] and show how they do all generally cond[illegible] the resistance of subjects: and when an[illegible] them gives any caveat to this, it is not in b[illegible] of the people, but *of the States of the King*[illegible] *who, they say, perhaps are impowered with aut*[illegible] *to curb the tyranny of Kings, as the Ephori* [illegible]

Lacedemonians, the Tribuns of the people, and Demarchs in Rome and Athens. Now it is acwledged, that if by the Laws of the King- it be found that the King is accountable to States, then their coërcing of him is not the ance of subjects, but rather the managing of Supream Power which lyes in their hands. en you will stand to their decision in this t, of the peoples resisting of their Sove- s, though Tyrants, the debate will not ong, they being so expres. And this will thing shaken by any thing you may alledge me corner of a *Peter Martyr*, or some Persons of less name; for as from the same ers, other places may be brought to the ary; so what can these serve to enervat so evident proof? Besides, we are not to der the writings of some particular Per- so much as what hath been the generally ved opinion among the Protestant Writers, most taught in their Pulpits and Schools. whoever will attempt the contradicting his hath been for absolut submission, it be confessed to be hard to determine, whi- is ignorance be most to be pitied, or his dence most wondered at. By these things y gues, if there be not strong grounds to hend the Reformed Churches must be in- t of that, which both their Confessions

diſown, and their Writers condemn.

Iſot. I confeſs the Author of the *Dialo* did with great confidence undertake the re ting of what is generally acknowledged ab reſiſtance uſed by the Reformed Churches: his Anſwerer hath ſo refuted all he alledg from Hiſtory, that I am confident he repent his undertaking: and were it to be done ag perhaps he would think on other tasks, the attempt what hath miſcarried ſo in his ha that truly I cannot but pity him in my heart.

Eud. It will be ſtrange if he be ſo much m ken as your Author repreſents him, yet his ſign in that was ſo good to deliver the Re mation from ſuch a challenge, that me think deſerved a little better uſage then your fri beſtows on him. But I am much deceive he be not able to make good all was aſſerte him: let us therefore hear what *Polyhiſtor* on theſe matters.

Iſot. Begin then with the matter of the *bigenſes*, where force was uſed againſt S *Monfort*, who had not only the permiſſio the *French* King, as is acknowledged, but aſſiſted by him by 15000. men, which is ched by ſome Authors: Beſides, that the c ties then uſed (which are made uſe of to ag vat their not reſiſting the King of *France* pertinently adduced, prove the King of *Fr*

g

y of acceſſion to them. And the Kings
Prince *Lewis*, coming with an army after-
l, ſhows all to have been done by the Kings
mand. And what is alledged from the
nt of *Tolouſe*, his being a Peer of *France*, by
h he was a vaſſal, and not a ſubject, is to no
oſe; ſince by the Feudal Law, vaſſals are
&s; and whatever authority they may have
n their own dominions, they are ſtill ſub-
to the Lord of the Feud. *See p.* 418.

ly. I ſhal not with big words blow away
you alledge; but ſhal examine it from the
nts are given of that war. It is true, the
ers of that time do ſo ſtrangely miſrepre-
heſe innocents, that little credit is due to
of the Hiſtories about them: but this
is clear, that the *Waldenſes* were every
e perſecuted, both in *Dauphiné*, *Provence*,
mont, *Calabria*, *Boheme*, and other places,
ich they ſcattered themſelves, and fled for
r: and notwithſtanding of all the perſe-
ns they lay under, from the Inquiſition in
e, they never armed againſt the Kings au-
ty. Theſe about *Alby* embracing the ſame
ine with the *Waldenſes*, and called from
Countrey, they lived in *Albigenſes*, were
dered againſt by the Pope, and a *Jacobin*
k being killed in their Countrey, *Pope In-*
proclaimed a *Croiſade*, promiſing Paradiſe

to all who came and fought against these He
ticks, and avenged the blood of that Mo
and in particular suspecting *Raymond* Coun
Tolouse, he excommunicated him, and absol
his subjects from their obedience, permit
any to pursue his person, and possess his la
with which he wrote to all Christian Prince
come into his *Croisade*. But the King of *Fr*
was imployed in wars both with the *Emp*
and King of *England*, and so could not joyn i
but gave way to his Barons to take the Cr
And here the King consenting to so cruel a
vasion, did undoubtedly shake much of his r
to these Provinces, since he thus exposed t
to the fury of an unjust Invader; so that tho
they had absolutly rejected his authority,
had quadrated with the case of a Kings d
ting of his subjects. However the war
on, all managed by the *Legat*, as the Popes
But *Raymond* came and submitted himself t
Pope, yet the *Legat* went on against *Bezier*
Carcasson, who had a great deal of reason t
sist such an unjust aggressor. Afterwards
Legat gaping for the County of *Tolouse*, pi
another quarrel with *Raymond*, and did exc
nicat him of new, though he had got the P
absolution: whereupon he armed, with th
sistance of the King of *Arragon*, against th
gat, and his General *Simon Monfort*:

rwards the King of *Arragon* was defeated,
all this while the King of *France* lay neutral,
would not permit his ſon to go againſt the
lbigenſes, becauſe he had promiſed to the
ng of *Arragon* to be neutral; but the King of
ragon being dead, he gave way to it, and ſo
ſon came to the army: and this muſt be that
ich *Gulielmus Brito* confounds with the be-
ning of the war. This alſo is that affair
ich the *Centuriators* ſay *Philippus Auguſtus*
with the *Albigenſes*. But the *Legat* fearing
numbers Prince *Lewis* brought with him,
apprehending he might have poſſeſſed him-
of the other places which belonged to the
igenſes, granted them all abſolution, with
protection of the Church; and aſſumed the
fidence to tell the Prince, that ſince he had
en the Croſs, he was to depend on his Or-
s, he repreſenting the Pope, and not to
mmand in that army as the Kings ſon; reproa-
ng him, becauſe his father had given no aſſi-
ce to the deſtruction of the *Albigenſes* when
re was need of it: but that after the miracu-
s victories had been obtained, he was now
ne to reap the Harveſt of what was due to
m who had hazarded their lives for the
urch. And for all this, I refer you to the
tory of the *Albigenſes*, compiled by *M. Per-*
lib. 1. *cap.* 12. *&c.* But what if by an *overplus*

I ſhould juſtifie the Count of *Tolouſe*, though
had armed againſt the King of *France*, upon
account of his being a Peer of *France*, which
empted him from the condition of ordinary ſu
jects, of whom *Paſquier Recherches de France, lib.*
cap. 8. ſaith, It was the vulgar opinion, that th
were cõſtituted by *Charles the Great*, who is be
ved to have given them almoſt as much autho
ty as himſelf had, reſerving only to himſelf
principal voice in the Chapter: but he refu
that vulgar error, and ſhows how in the end
the *Carolovingian* race, great confuſions were
France, partly through the various pretende
but more through their folly: at which ti
the Crown of *France* did likewiſe become e
ctive: and he ſhows how *Eude*, *Robert*, *Ra*
Lewis, ſurnamed *beyond the Sea*, *Lothair*, and a
ther *Lewis*, were choſen Kings of *France*;
the chief Perſons who at that time were m
active, were theſe Dukes, Counts, and Biſho
who afterwards were made Peers. *Hugo C*
therefore taking poſſeſſion of the Crown,
ſecuring himſelf peaceably in it, did conf
thoſe Peers in that great authority they had
ſumed; which if he had not done, they had
ven him more trouble. And their conſtitu
was, that if any difference aroſe, either betw
the King, & any of the Peers, or among the Pe
themſelves, it ſhould be decided by the Cou

he whole twelve Peers. And he proves from ld *Placart*, that they would not admit the *ncelor*, *Conneſtable*, or any other great Officer *France* to judge them; they being to be jud- by none, but their fellow Peers. Theſe were to be the *Electors* of the King. But *Hugo et* apprehending the danger of a free ele- n, cauſed, for preventing it, crown his ſon is own time, which was practiſed by four or ſucceeding Kings. And *Lewis the Groß* not ng crowned in his fathers time, met with he difficulty at his entry to the Crown; which guard againſt, he crowned his ſon in his own e, and ſo that practiſe continued, till the pre- ce of electing the King was worn out by pre- ption. Yet ſome veſtiges of it do ſtill re- n, ſince there muſt be at all Coronations of *nce* twelve to repreſent the Peers: and by time, I think it is well enough made out, t the Count of *Tolouſe* was not an ordinary ject. And as for your confounding of ſub- t and vaſſal, *Bodinus lib. de Rep. cap. 9.* will p you to find out a difference betwixt them, o reckons up many kinds of vaſſals and feu- aries who are not ſubjects: for a vaſſal is he t holds lands of a ſuperior Lord, upon ſuch ditions as are agreed to by the nature of the d, and is bound to protect the Superior, but y quite the feud, by which he is free of that

ſub-

ſubjection: ſo that the dependence of vaſſals their Lord, muſt be determined by the contr betwixt them, and not by the ordinary laws ſubjects. And from this he concluds, that o may be a ſubject and no vaſſal, a vaſſal and ſubject, and likewiſe both vaſſal and ſubje The Peers of *France* did indeed give an oath homage, by which they became the liege-m of the King, but were not for that his ſubje for the oath the ſubjects ſwore, was of a greater extent. And thus I am deceived if was aſſerted by the *Conformiſt* in the *Dialo* on this head, be not made good.

Iſot. But ſince you examine this inſtance accuratly, what ſay you to thoſe of *Piedmont*, w made a League among themſelves againſt th Prince, and did reſiſt his cruel perſecutions armes. *See paz.* 423.

Poly. Truly, I can ſay little on this ſubj having ſeen none of their writings or Apologi ſo that I know not on what grounds they we and I ſee ſo much ignorance and partiality in counts given from the ſecond hand, that I dom conſider them much.

Iſot. The next inſtance in Hiſtory, is, fr the wars of *Boheme*, where becauſe the Cha was denyed, the people did by violence re their King, and were headed by *Ziſca*, w gained many victories in the following w

th *Sigismund*; and in the same Kingdom fifty
ars ago, they not only resisted first *Matthias*,
d then *Ferdinand* their King, but rejected his
thority, and choosed a new King: and the ac-
unt of this change, was, because he would not
ke good what *Maximilian* and *Rodolph* did
ant about the free exercise of their Religion:
d thus when engagements were broken to
em, they did not judge themselves bound to
t tame submission you plead for. *See p.* 424.

Poly. Remember what was laid down as a
ound, that the Laws of a Society must deter-
ne who is invested with the Soveraign Power,
hich doth not always follow the title of a
ng: but if he be accountable to any other
urt, he is but a subject, and the Soveraign
wer rests in that Court. If then it be made
t that the States of *Boheme* are the Soveraigns,
d that the Kings are accountable to them, this
tance will not advance the plea of defensive
mes by subjects. That the Crown of *Boheme*
elective, was indeed much contraverted; and
s at length, and not without great likelyhoods
both sides, of late debated in diverse wri-
gs: but among all that were impartial, they
evailed who pleaded its being elective. Yet
acknowledge this alone will not prove it free
r the people to resist, unless it be also apparent
at the Supream Power remained with the
States,

States, which as it is almoſt alwayes found: dwel with the people, when the King is electe by them. *Bodin* doth reckon the King of *Bohem* among theſe that are but Titular Kings: and th Provincial Conſtitutions of that Kingdom c evidently demonſtrat, that the King is only th Adminiſtrator, but not the fountain of the Power: which is made out from many inſtan ces, by him who writes the *Republick of Bohem* who ſhows how theſe Kings are bound to fo low the pleaſure and Counſel of their State and in the year 1135. is was decreed, that th electèd Prince of *Boheme* ſhould bind himſelf t his Coronation Oath to rules there ſet dow which if he broke, the States were to pay hi no tributs, nor to be tyed to any further obe dience to him, till he amended. *See Hagecus ann.* 1135. And this Oath was taken by all th following Dukes and Kings of *Boheme*; whic is an evident proof that the States had authori over their Kings, and might judge them. T this alſo might be added diverſe inſtances c their depoſing their Kings, upon which n cenſure ever paſſed. Theſe being then th grounds on which the *Bohemians* walked, it clear they never juſtified their reſiſtance, on th account of ſubjects fighting for Religion, b on the liberties of a free State, aſſerting the Religion when invaded by a limited Prince

Th

e account of the first *Bohemian* war, is, that
Huſs and *Jerome of Prague*, being notwith-
ding of the Emperors Safe-conduct burnt at
ſtance, the whole States of *Boheme* and *Mo-*
a met at *Prague*, and found that by the bur-
g of their Doctors, an injury was done to the
ole Kingdom, which was thereby marked
h the ſtain of Hereſie: and they firſt expo-
ated with the Emperor and Counſel about
wrong done them; but no reparation being
de, they reſolved to ſeek it by force, and to
end the Religion had been preached by
ſs; and did declare their deſign to *Wenceſlaus*
ir King (whom the States had before that
e made priſoner twice for his maleverſation)
at that very time he died in an Apoplexy,
e ſay through grief at that. After his death,
ſmund his brother pretended to the Crown
Boheme; but not being elected, was not their
hteous King: ſo in the following wars that
re betwixt him and *Ziſca*, the reſiſtance was
made to the King of *Boheme*, and therefore
that time was an *Interregnum*, and is ſo mar-
d by their Hiſtorian, who tells that the *Bohe-*
ns could not be induced to receive him to be
ir King: he indeed invaded the Kingdom,
crowned himſelf, but was not choſen by the
tes till fifteen years after that a Peace was
cluded, & he with great difficulty prevailed
upon

upon the States to ratifie his Coronation, and a
knowledge him their King. *See Dub. lib.* 2
& lib. 26. And by all this, I doubt not but y
are convinced that the wars of *Ziſca* were not
the nature of ſubjects reſiſting their Soverai
And for the late *Bohemian* war, beſides what w
already alledged of the power of the State
their war againſt *Ferdinand*, and the reaſon w
by a ſolemn decree they rejected him, was b
cauſe he invaded the Crown without an e
ction, contrary to the fundamental Laws of t
Kingdom: hereupon they chooſed the *Pri*
Elector Palatin to be their King. It is true th
roſe alſo in armes while *Matthias* lived, thou
he did not long ſurvive theſe tumults: but in
their Apologies they founded their plea ont
Liberties of the Kingdom of *Boheme*. A
yet though this ſay much for their defence,
am none of the Patrons of that war, which h
very few defenders among the Proteſtants.

Iſot. At length you muſt yeeld there was w
for defence of Religion: but if without thei
cloſure of *Boheme* we examine the Hiſtory
Germany, there we meet with that famous *Sm*
caldick war, in oppoſition to *Charles* the 5. w
was deſigning the overthrow of the Proteſt
doctrine, which the *Elector* of *Saxony*, with t
Landgrave of *Heſſen*, and other free Cities, m
naged againſt him. *See p.* 427.

Po

oly. If any of the passions of men have min-
in the actions of Protestants, must these
efore be fastened on them as their doctrine;
cially when they went not upon principles
eligion, but of Provincial Laws? As for
many, let me first tell you how far the Prote-
ts were against Rebellion, upon pretence of
igion. At first the *Rustick war* had almost
dled all *Germany*, which indeed begun upon
unjust causes; but *Sleydan lib.* 5. tells, That
*troublesome Preachers had been the causers of
great and formidable war.* Now it is to little
pose to say they were in many errors, and so
ght not for the true Religion; since it was
re made out, that if Religion be to be
ght for, every man believing his own Reli-
n to be true, is bound to take armes in its de-
e, since even an erring conscience binds:
as these Tumults did spread through *Ger-
y*, *Luther* published a Writing, desiring all
bstain from sedition, though withall he told
pprehended *some strange judgement was han-
over the Church-men: but that was to be left to
D.* After which he explains the duty of
Magistrats: And adds, That *the people should
verely charged not to stir without the command of
Magistrats, and that nothing was to be attemp-
by privat persons: that all sedition was against the
mand of GOD, and that sedition was nothing
but*

but privat revenge, and therefore hated by GO
Adding, *That the ſeditions then ſtirring, were ra*
by the Devil, who ſtirred up theſe who profeſſed
Goſpel to them, that thereby the truth might be brou
under hatred and reproach, as if that could not be
GOD which gave occaſion to ſo great evils. Th
he tells what means were to be uſed for adv
cing of the Goſpel, *That they were to repent of th*
ſins, for which GOD had permitted that tyra
of the Church-men. Next, *That they ſhould p*
for the divine ayd, and publickly aſſert the truth
the Goſpel, and diſcover the impoſtures of the Pop
And he adds, *That this had been his method, wh*
had been much bleſſed of GOD. In a word, t
whole ſtrain of that firſt Paper ſhows, that t
great bait uſed to train all into that Rebelli
was the pretence of the liberty of Religion, a
the tyrannical oppreſſion they were kept und
by the Eccleſiaſticks.

But upon this the Boures publiſhed a W
ting containing their Grievances: The fi
whereof was, *That they might have liberty to ch*
Miniſters, who might preach the Word of GO
purely to them, without the mixture of mens devi
The other particulars related to their Civil
berties. And upon theſe pretenſions they
pealed to *Luther*, who wrote again, *Acknowl*
ging the great guilt of theſe Princes who received
the purity of the Goſpel; but he warns the peo

onsider what they did, *lest they lost both body soul in what they attempted. That they were er to consider their own strength, nor the faulti- of their adversaries, but the justice and lawful- f the cause; and to be careful not to believe all preathings; for the Devil had raised up many ions and bloody Teachers at that time.* Where- he forbids them *to take GODS Name in , and pretend that they desired in all things to fol- his Lawes:* But minds them *who threatned, they who took the sword, should perish by the d: and of the Apostle, who commands all to be ent to Magistrats, charging on them, that though retended the Laws of GOD, yet they took the , and resisted the Magistrat.* But he adds, *say, the Magistrats become intolerable, for ake the doctrine of the Gospel from us, and op- us to the highest degree: But be it so, stirrs and ons are not therefore to be raised, neither must one coërce crimes, that belongs to him to whom wer of the sword is given, as is expres in Scrip- And besides, this is not only according to the , but is by the light of Nature impressed on all minds: which shows, that no man can cognosce udge in his own cause, since all men are blinded elf-love: And it cannot be denyed, but this tu- and sedition of yours, is a privat revenge: But if ave any warrant for this from GOD, you make it out by some signal miracle. The*

Magistrat indeed doth unjustly, but you much m
so, who contemning the Command of GOD, inv
anothers Jurisdiction. And he tells them, *Th*
these things take place, there will be no more Ma
stracy, nor Courts of Justice, if every man exer
privat revenge. And if this be unlawful in a p
vat person, much more is it so in a multitude gath
together. Wherefore he counts them *unwo*
of the name of Christians, nay worse then Turks,
thus violat the laws of Nature. Then for pr
of his opinion, he adduceth *that of our LOR*
resist not evil; as also his reproving of S. Peter
smiting with the sword. These steps were to be
lowed by you, saith he, *or this glorious title mu*
laid down. And if you followed his exam
GODS power would appear, and he would
doubtedly have regard to you. And he adds, *H*
far he had been always from such practises, and
GOD had blessed his work in his hands: bu
you, you advert not how much you obstruct that w
you think to promove. These are a few of *Lu*
words, by which it will appear both upon w
pretences these Boures went, and what his
of them was. But I know it will be said, th
in the first ages of the Church, these good
ple men understood not their liberties nor
viledges, but were whedled into a sheepish t
ness: so likewise when the Reformation
first springing, they did not in that infa
un

erſtand the heroick doctrine, that the follo-
g ripeneſs of ſome martial ſpirits did broach
maintain. Alace! *Luther*, poor man! he
been bred in his Monaſtery, and underſtood
the brave atchievements of Chriſtian Che-
y.

ut who would bear with ſuch disingenuity,
ſay, that becauſe he defines ſedition to
ɒtivat revenge, and afterwards condemns
at revenge, therefore he muſt be under-
d as only condemning that? *p.* 432. But
one that reads *Sleydan* dare ſay that I have al-
ed one word in *Luthers* name, but what is
fully tranſlated out of theſe writings: ſo
arcells I have here inſerted, will clearly
ver that Rebellion to have been colored
with the pretence of oppreſſion, perſecu-
, and hindering the doctrine of the Goſpel:
Luthers opinion in that muſt not be looked
n, as only his privat ſenſe, but that which
undoubtedly received by the reſt of the
eſtants in *Germany*, as appears by the ſeries
he Story. And whatever paſſion *Luther*
ht have expreſſed, that will no more bran-
what I ſay, then any of his other unjuſtifia-
fervors will ſhake the reſt of his doctrine.
I do not adduce him here only as a privat
tor ſpeaking his ſingle thoughts, but as the
d of the Proteſtants, delivering a doctrine

which was then received among them.

Ifot. But he afterwards changed his opini
when the League of *Smalcald* was entred unt
and then we find the Proteſtants in another tu
for upon apprehenſions of miſchief deſign
againſt them, they entred in a defenſive Leag
among themſelves: though the conſtitution
the Empire being feudal, the Emperor was th
Soveraign: yet both Princes and free Cities
tred in this League, which afterwards broke
into war. *See p.* 433.

Poly. Before I examine that affair, I muſt
clear the way by removing a miſtake, wh
truly I judged none capable of that had ever
any thing of the Conſtitution of the *German*
pire, or of the power of the *Electors*, *Princes*,
free Cities. I muſt therefore ſince I have to
with ſo much ignorance or perverſneſs, ſ
that the Emperor is not Soveraign in *Germ*
though the thing is ſo plain, that I am al
aſhamed to go about it. The *German Em*
was hereditary from the days of *Charles the*
till *Henry the Fowler*, and then it begun to be
ctive: and as is uſual in all ſuch caſes, they
had the right of election, got by degrees th
thority transferred upon themſelves: but
particular time when this begun, is not ſo c
ly defined by the *German* Writers. It is t
the *Diet* of *Germany* is not like the Leag

United Provinces, or of the Cantons of *Swit-*
and, where the authority remains with the
ral States and Cantons, and they only meet
Counsel: but the *Diet* hath the supream au-
ity, both of deposing of Emperors, as was
tized in the case of *Adolphus* and *Wenceslaus*,
of fining, banishing, and forfeiting, either
ces or Cities. And the Princes declare af-
he Emperor is crowned, that they are the
ls of the Empire, and not of the Emperor.
when the Diet sits not, all things are judged
ne *Imperial Chamber*, whose President must
Prince of the Empire, who hath six Asses-
from the Emperor, seven from the seven
tors, twenty from the ten Circles, two from
of them; and by them all the differences
ng the Princes or members of the Empire
ecided. Upon greater occasions, the Diet
led, which *Thuan* compares to the Assem-
of the *Amphictyons* in *Greece*, that was
up of Princes, who had no dependance
pon another. The Diet is not called by
Emperor, but by the Decree of a former
: or if the Emperor call one, the Princes
ot bound to come to it. And so the Prin-
efused to come *anno* 1554. and *anno* 1566.
ne Diet Laws are given to the Emperor, as
as to the other Princes: and any money is
d for the use of the Empire, is not put in

the Emperors hands, but in the bank of so
Town, as shal be agreed on. *Bodin* tells he s
letters from a *German* Prince to *Monmora*
telling him that the King of *France* had rea
to complain of *Charles* the fifth, and of his br
ther, to the Duke of *Saxony*, and the Count P
latine, who were the Vicars of the Empire, b
cause they had, contrary to the Laws of the E
pire, and former customs, suppressed the Kin
letters to the States of the Empire. And *Ma*
milian the first in a Diet at *Constance*, *anno* 15
acknowledged that the Majesty of the *Ger*
Empire consisted in the Princes, and not in
Emperor himself. I might here add m
from the way of the Emperors treating with
Princes, by sending and receiving of Amba
dors that go betwixt them, by the state in wh
he receives visits from them, and returns th
to them, by the Princes treating and being t
ted with, by all forreign Princes, who w
to them *Brother*, and not *Cousin*, by their
king of Peace and War among themselves:
should indeed run out into a long digression
I adduced all might be alledged for proving
Princes of the Empire to be none of the Em
rors subjects: but I have no mind to engag
a vain show of reading upon so plain a sub
One thing I shal only add, that by the 12. C
ter of the *Bulla Aurea*, it is expresly provi

t the Electors ſhal meet together yearly in four weeks that follow Eaſter, for conſul- about the affairs of the Empire: and this hus explained in the 4. Article of the *Ceſa- Capitulation, That it ſhal be free for the ſix ctors by the vigor of the Bulla Aurea, to t together as often as they pleaſe, for conſul- about the Commonwealth, and that the Em- r ſhal make no hinderance to it, nor take it in art.* And hence it is that theſe who give ount of the ſtate of the Empire, laugh at their orance, who through a childiſh miſtake ribe the Soveraign Power to the Emperor. e ſame may be added of the free Cities uni- together by a League at leaſt 500. years old, ed the *Hanſe-towns*, who came under the tection of the Maſter of the *Teutonick Order*, poſſeſſed *Pruſſe*: and *an.* 1206. they were ree, that they ſent a Navy to *Henry* the third *England*, and got great priviledges from him their traffick in *England*. There were then Cities in the League, who renewed their gue every tenth year, and conſulted whom ceeive, or whom to exclud from their friend- , and chooſed a Protector to themſelves: one of the conditions on which any City ht be of this League, was, that they were Towns: and therefore it was that ſome wns in the *Netherlands* being of this League,

their Princes were by oath to confirm their fre
dom, otherwiſe they could not be compreh
ded within that League; the end whereof w
to defend one another in any neceſſity th
might fall in. Let theſe things then decla
whither *Germany* be a Monarchy or not, and
will never prove the Emperor to be the So
raign, becauſe the Empire is feudal, and t
Emperor gives the inveſtitures to the Prince
for they are not the Feudatories of the Emp
ror, but of the Empire: and the Emperor
giving the Inveſtiture becomes not their Lor
for in the Interregn of the Empire, the *Elect*
of *Palatin* and *Saxe* are the Vicars of the E
pire, and give the Inveſtitures, who are not c
thed with any authority over the reſt, but o
as they are the Vicars of the Empire, and not
the Emperor. And moſt of the Princes of *I*
receive ſtill their Inveſtiture from the Empe
but are far from concluding themſelves his ſu
jects upon that account. And who thinks t
King of *Naples* the Popes ſubject, though
receive his Inveſtiture in that Crown from hi
Theſe things being thus cleared, it will be e
dent that the wars betwixt *Charles* the 5. and
Duke of *Saxony*, will never be a precedent
ſubjects reſiſting their Soveraign. And havi
ſaid ſo much, it will be to no purpoſe to e
mine the riſe and progreſs of the *Smalcal*

Leag

gue and war, only this much is clear, that leaguing of the Princes and Cities together ong themſelves, or with other Princes, was held contrary to the laws of the Empire: for r the *Smalcaldic* League, both the Emperor other Kings, as *France* and *England*, treated h them, and ſent Ambaſſadors to them: Yea, Pope ſent a *Nuncio* to the Elector of *Saxe*, *Landgrave* of *Heſſen* at *Smalcald*, and yet ne- were they accuſed by the Emperor for en- g into that League of mutual defence: which ws it was not judged contrary to the duty of ſe Princes to aſſociat among themſelves, or h others. And the City of *Strasburg*, and r them the *Landgrave* of *Heſſen*, made a gue with the *Switzer Cantons* that received Reformation, for mutual defence againſt invaſion upon the account of Religion. At *sburg* the Emperor did on the 11. of *No- ber* 1530. declare, that ſince the Proteſtants reject the Decree made about Religion, he entred in an agreement with the reſt of the t, not to offend any, but to defend them- es, if any force were uſed againſt theſe who ed that Religion. And in the following *ember* the Proteſtant Princes met at *Smal-*, and made an agreement among themſelves he ſame ſtrain: neither were they ever con- nned for ſo doing, but continued in a good

orre-

correſpondence with the Emperor many ye
after that, till being invaded by the Duke
Brunſwick, the war took its riſe, which is
along proved to have been according to t
Laws and Liberties of the Empire. And th
this caſe doth vary exceedingly from the m
ter of our debates.

Eud. If I may glean after your Harveſt,
could add, that the Divines of *Germany* w
notwithſtanding of all the immunity of t
Princes, and injuries they met with, very mu
againſt all warlick preparations. Many ve
ges of this appear through *Melanctons* lett
particularly in his 71. Letter to *Camerarius*
1528. where he gives account of the incli
tions many had to war, and with how much
ligence he had ſtudied to divert them from
though great injuries had been done them;
that it was believed that many of the Prin
had ſigned a conſpiracy againſt them. A
Scultet Exer. Evang. lib. 2. *cap.* 5. tells h
Grumbachius and *Juſtus Jonas* animated the E
ctor of *Saxe* to the war, aſſuring him of the E
pire of *Germany*, if he would adventure for
which, he adds, the Elector did: and his
doing, he compares to his throwing him
over the Pinacle of the Temple: but all quic
repented them of the attempt, the Elector
ing defeated, taken, and kept priſoner m
ye

rs, and his ill Counſellers were well ſerved their advice, *Grumbachius* was quartered, *Jonas* was beheaded. Thus you ſee how war is cenſured by one of the beſt of the late *man* Divines. By this time, I think no ples can dwel with any about the *German* , and that it agrees with the caſe of a Prince ending his Religion and ſubjects, againſt unjuſt invaſion of another Prince, to whom owes neither obedience nor ſubjection: and will eaſily ſatisfie all that know either Law Hiſtory, whither the Author of the *Dialogues* erved to be treated as his *Anſwerer* doth: it is no new thing to find ignorants full of fidence, and cowards full of boaſtings.

Iſot. But for *Sweden*, you yeeld it, and acowledge, that becauſe their King came inſt them in an unjuſt invaſion, deſigning ſubvert their Religion, they not only armed inſt him, and reſiſted him, but depoſed him, l put his uncle in his place, then which nong can be more expreſs. *See p.* 441.

Poly. The deſign of the *Conformiſt* was to ove that the firſt Reformers did not teach e doctrine of ſubjects their reſiſtance upon the count of Religion; but he meant not to make od all that followed after that: therefore t the more inconſiderat when they heard of e States of *Sweden* their depoſing of *Sigiſmund*, might

might have mistaken that, as he knows so
have done, and confounded it with the Refo
mation, he gave the true account of that affa
as it was: and it being seventy years after t
Reformation was first brought thither, cann
be fastened on the Reformation. Besides t
whole tract of the *Swedish History* proves, th
the Estats, as they elected, so also coërced, a
frequently deposed their Kings: and ther
fore *Bodin* reckons *Sweden* among these divid
States, where the Supream Power lay betwi
the King and the Nobility: and tells how
his own time *Henry* King of *Sweden* having k
led with his own hand, one that presented a p
tition to him, the States forced him to quite t
Kingdom to his brother: and that he had be
for seventeen years a prisoner when he wro
his Books *de Republica*: It being thus freque
in *Sweden* upon malversation, not only to resi
but to depose their Kings, it was no wonde
when *Sigismund* came against them with an arm
of *Polanders*, whose Soveraign he was not, (
none are so ignorant to think the King of P
land is a Soveraign) they resisted him: sin
that was a subjecting of *Sweden* to forreign for
and so did totally overturn the whole found
tion of the Kingdom. But after all this, I m
add, that *Charles* Duke of *Suderman*, was n
too well reported of, for that abrogation of h

Neph

hew, it being generally imputed to his am-
on. And thus you see upon how many ac-
nts that action of the *Swedish* State will not
e your turn.

Sot. But these of *Zurich* resisted the other
Cantons, and being provoked by their in-
es, they stopt the passages of victuals to
n, upon which a war followed. As also at
el, the people did maintain and assert the Re-
nation by armes against their Superiors, and
ke the Images, and burnt them: they also
le the Senat turn off some of their number
o favored the Mass. *See p.* 443. 444.

Poly. As for the war among the *Cantons*, it is
enyable that it was not of subjects against
r Soveraigns, since the Cities of *Helvetia*
e no dependance one upon another; nor can
one City be tyed to the opinion or decree of
rest, without their own consent: which
ws that every *Canton* is a free State within its
, and therefore their warrings among them-
es, makes nothing for subjects resisting of
r Soveraigns. And what is alledged from
tumult of *Basel*, is as little to our purpose:
these free Cities being Democratical, it was
wonder if the people offended with the Se-
did raise that commotion: and the Histo-
expressly asserts, that what they did, they
nly declared, was not for defence of Religiō,
but

but for vindicating of their own liberty. A
in the end of the Story it appears what they
ſigned, for they made the Senat receive 260.
of the Compagnies of the Citizens, whoſe co
ſel ſhould be carried along in the greater c
cernments, that might be either for GOD
glory, or the good of the Commonwealth.
if you lay claim to this Story as a precedent,
muſt acknowledge that a Reformation may
not only maintained by force, but that Ma
ſtrats may be removed from their Office, if t
go not along with it; and that the people may
their own authority, without waiting for
Magiſtrats concurrence, go by violence
break down Images, and throw out an eſta
ſhed Religion. But this belongs not to
caſe of ſubjects, ſince in theſe free Cities the
wer is certainly with the people, and ſo t
are not ſubjects to the Senat. And for *Geneve*
is ſo fully proved, that it was a free Impe
City, that I need add nothing to make it
One inſtance will abundantly ſuffice to pre
upon the belief of any who can doubt whi
the Biſhop of *Geneve* was their Prince, wh
is, that the Biſhops of *Geneve* did frequently
come Burgeſſes in it: In particular, *Peter*
Baulm, the laſt who ſate there, was receive
Citizen by the Senat of *Geneve* 15. *July* 15
which doth fully prove that he could not
th

r Lord. But as for the Reformation of *Ge-*
, it is true *Sleydan* hints as if the Bishop and
gy had left the City, being angry at the Re-
nation: but in that he was mistaken, for
r Bishop left the City *an.* 1528. and made
against it upon some disputes were betwixt
and them about their priviledges: for
gh he was not Lord of the City, yet the
ntrey about it belonged to him. But *an.*
3. he returned to the City, and left it in the
of the same year, fearing some seditious
ults, which he had the more reason to ap-
hend, because of his transactions with the
e of *Savoy*, whereby he made over to him
nterest in the City. And it was two years
r this before the Reformation was received
hat City. For after he left them, they pas-
a Decree for preserving the old Religion,
discharging of the *Lutheran*, and banished
of the Ministers of that Religion. And on
first of *January* 1534. after the Bishop was
e, his Vicar published an Edict, discharging
Assemblies for Divine Worship, without the
ops permission; and all Bibles in the *French*
German tongues, were condemned to be
nt. And for the Duke of *Savoy* his inva-
g them, and being resisted by them, it makes
hing for your design, this being a free Im-
ial City, resisting an unjust Invader. *For all*
see Geneva restituta. *Isot.*

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF SCOTLAND

Isot. But at least the States of the United Pr
vinces did maintain their Religion by arm
when *Philip* the second was introducing the I
quisition among them: and though these w
were upon mixed grounds, so that Papists
well as Protestants concurred in them, yet it
undenyable that Religion gave the chief rise
them, and was the main consideration that
gaged the Protestants into that war. *See p*
446.

Poly. One error runs through all your sm
terings, which is, that you never distinguish b
twixt a State governed by a Monarch, wh
subjection is due to him by the constitution
the State, and a limited Prince, who by the l
of that Society is accountable to, and censura
by the Nobility and people; which states
great a difference, that he must be very p
blind who doth not observe it; And there
I will first show you, that the Prince of the N
therlands was but a precarious Prince, governi
a free people at their pleasure and precarious
as *Heuterus* and *Grotius de Ant. Reip. Batav.* c
him: And among the Laws of the Governm
of *Batavia*, one was, that the old Customes
Laws should be sacred; and that if the Prince
creed ought against them, he was not to
obeyed: and so it was usual among them up
a transgression, to depose their Princes, of wh
ma

ny instances are reckoned by *Grotius*, and
erefore he compares their Princes to the *La-*
emonian Kings, upon whom the *Ephori* and
Senat might have cognosced. The *Bra-*
ins had indeed looked better to their liberty
n the rest, and so had guarded against the de-
of their Princes (who might have broken
ir Laws upon the pretence of a publick good)
an expres agreement, that if their Prince
ld violat the Laws, they should not be tyed
bedience nor fidelity to him, till their inju-
were removed: and this was confirmed by
examples of their Ancestors, *Gr. An. lib.* 2.
a little after, he adds, That the other Pro-
es in *Belgium*, had by practise that same pri-
dge, and that the rather, that being all uni-
o *Brabant* by *Maximilian*, they were to
y the same priviledges with them. The
antins had also a priviledge of choosing a
servator in any great hazard, called *Ruart*,
da tom. 1. *lib.* 9. whose power was equal
e *Roman* Dictators: this they had by the
iledges of the *Letus introitus*. And upon
they choosed the Prince of *Orange* their
t, *anno* 1577. And to run no further for
fs of this, when *Philip* was inaugurated their
ce, he expresly provided, that if he broke
priviledges, they should be free from obe-
ce and fidelity to him: and this was the

ground on which they depoſed him, as appea
by their Decree, *St. tom.* 2. *lib.* 4. By theſe i
dications it is apparent, that the Prince of t
Netherlands was not Soveraign of theſe Prov
ces, ſince they could cognoſce upon him, a
ſhake off his authority. But I ſhal next ma
out, that *Religion* was not the ground up
which theſe wars were raiſed: The Reform
tion came unto the Provinces in *Charles* the
his time, who cruelly perſecuted all who rec
ved it, ſo that theſe who were butchered in
time, are reckoned not to be under 1000
Gr. Annal. lib. 1. All this cruelty did neit
provoke them to armes, nor quench the ſp
of Reformation; whereupon *Philip* deſigned
introduce the Inquiſition among them, as an
ſured mean of extinguiſhing that light.
that Court was every where ſo odious, and p
ceeded ſo illegally, that many of the Nobili
among whom diverſe were Papiſts, entred i
Confederacy againſt it, promiſing to defend
another, if endangered: Upon this, there w
firſt Petitions, and after that tumults; but it w
no further till the Duke of *Alva* came, and p
ceeded at the rate of the higheſt Tyranny i
ginable, both againſt their lives and fortu
particularly againſt the Counts of *Egmont*
Horn, ſuſpect of favoring the former di
ders. But (it being needleſs to make a
ſh

w of reading in a thing which every boy may
ow) after the Duke of *Alva* had so transfessed all limits, the Nobility and Deputies of
Towns of *Holland*, who were the Depositas of the Laws and Priviledges of that State,
at *Dort*, *anno* 1572. *Gr. de Ant. Bat. cap.* 6.
on the 19. *July* decreed a war against the
ke of *Alve*, and made the Prince of *Orange*
ir Captain, which was done upon his exag the twentieth penny of their rents, and
tenth of their moveables, in all their transans and merchandises. Yet all this while
Power was in the hands of Papists, *Gr. An- lib.* 3. Nor was the Protestant Religion
mitted till the year 1578. that in *Amsterdam*,
echt and *Harlem*, the Magistrats who were
icted to the *Roman* Religion, were turned
, which gave great offence to some of their
federats who adhered to Popery. And
n this the Protestants petitioned the Archke *Matthias*, whom the States had chosen
their Prince, that since it was known that
were the chief object of the *Spanish* hatred,
so might look for the hardest measure, if
prevailed: it was therefore just they who
in the chief danger, might now enjoy some
e of the liberty with the rest, wherefore
desired they might have Churches allowed
n, and might not be barred from publick

truſt, which after ſome debate was grante
And let this declare whither the war was ma
ged upon the grounds of Religion, or not. T
year after this, the States of *Holland*, *Gelde*
Zeland, *Utrecht*, and *Frieſland*, met at *Utrec*
and entred in that Union which continues
this day: by which it was provided, that t
Reformed Religion ſhould be received in *H*
land and *Zeland*, but the reſt were at liberty,
ther to chooſe it or another, or both, as th
pleaſed. So we ſee they did not confede
againſt *Spain* upon the account of Religion,
not being the ground of their League; bu
oppoſition to the *Spaniſh* Tyranny and pri
And in their Letters to the Emperor 8. *Jan*
1578. *Str. tom.* 2. *lib.* 2. they declared, t
they never were, nor ever ſhould be of anot
mind, but that the Catholick Religion ſho
be ſtill obſerved in *Holland*: and in the end
the year 1581. they decreed, that *Philip*
forfeited his Title to the Principality of
gium, by his violating their Priviledges, wh
he had ſworn to obſerve: whereupon they w
(according to their compact with him at his
auguration) free from their obedience to h
and therefore they chooſed the Duke of *A*
ſon to be their Prince. And now review
this, and ſee if you can ſtand to your forme
ſertion, or believe theſe wars to have proce
u

on the grounds of ſubjects reſiſting their So-
aign, when he perſecutes them upon the ac-
nt of Religion, and you will be made to ac-
owledge, that the States of *Holland* were not
jects, and that their quarrel was not Reli-
n.

Iſot. All this will perhaps be anſwered in due
e: but from this let me lead you to *France*,
ere we find a long tract of Civil Wars upon
account of Religion, and here you cannot
end the King is a limited Soveraign; neither
this war managed by the whole States of
nce, but by the Princes of the blood, with
Nobility of ſome of the Provinces; and theſe
un under *Francis* the ſecond, then about ſix-
years of age, ſo that he was not under
age: and though they were proſecuted un-
the minority of *Charles* the 9. yet the King
Navarre who was Regent, and ſo bore the
gs authority, was reſiſted: and after *Charles*
of age, the wars continued, both during his
n, and much of his brothers, and did again
k out in the laſt Kings reign. The Prote-
ts were alſo owned and aſſiſted in theſe wars,
only by the Princes of *Germany*, but by the
e laſt Princes who reigned in *Britain*. So
we have an undenyable inſtance of ſub-
defending Religion by armes. *See pag.*

Poly. I muſt again put my ſelf and the co
pany, to a new penance by this ill underſtoo
piece of Hiſtory, which you have alledged
and tell you how upon *Henry* the ſeconds deat
Francis his ſon, was under age by the *Fren*
Law, (for which ſee *Thuan. lib.* 16.) which a
pointed the Regents power to continue till th
King was 22. years of age at leaſt, as had bee
done in the caſe of *Charles* the 6. which yet th
Hiſtory of that time ſaith, was a rare priv
ledge, granted him becauſe of his gracefulnes
and the love was generally born him, where
the year wherein the Kings were judged c
pable of the Government was 25. But *Fran*
though under age being every way a child, di
ſet away both the Princes of the blood, the Co
ſtable and the Admiral from the Governme
which he committed to his Mother, the C
dinal of *Lorrain* and the Duke of *Guiſe.* Up
this the Princes of the blood met, and ſent th
King of *Navarre* who was the firſt Prince of th
blood, to the King, to complain of their
uſage: but though he was much neglected
Court, yet his ſimplicity was ſuch, that he w
eaſily whedled out of his pretenſions. Upon th
the Prince of *Condé* having a greater ſpirit a
being poor, thought upon other courſes, a
as it is related by *Davila lib.* 1. gathered a me
ting at *Ferté*, where he propoſed the inju
dic

ne the Princes of the blood, who in the mino-
y of their King were now excluded the Go-
nment: which contrary to the *Salick* law, was
in a womans hand, and truſted to ſtrangers:
erefore he moved that (according to the pra-
ſes of other Princes of the blood, in the like
ſes, which he adduced) they might by arms
ke good their right, and aſſume the Govern-
et in the Kings minority. But the Admiral
nſidering well the hardineſs of the enterpriſe,
d, that another way muſt be taken to make it
cceed, which was, that ſince *France* was full
the followers of *Calvin*, who through the per-
utions they had lyen under, were now almoſt
ſperat, and had a particular hatred at the bre-
en of *Lorrain* as their chief enemies, therefore
was fit to cheriſh them, and make a party of
em, by which means aſſiſtance might be like-
ſe hoped for from the Princes of *Germany*, and
e Queen of *England*: and to this advice all pre-
nt did yeeld. Upon this, ſaith *Thuan lib.* 16.
any writings were publiſhed, proving the Go-
rnment of the Kingdom in the Kings minori-
to belong to the Princes of the blood, and
at by the Laws of *France*, the Regents power
s not abſolute, but to be regulated by the Aſ-
mbly of the States, wherein many inſtances of
e *French* Law were adduced: and whereas it
s alledged that the King was major at 15.

which was proved from an Edict of *Charles* th
fifths, this was fully refuted; and it was shewe
that notwithstanding of the Edict of *Charles* th
fifth, his son was not admitted to the Gover
ment till he was full 22. years of age, and that i
his minority the Kingdom was governed by
Counsel of the Princes and Nobility, which wa
established by an Assembly of the States. I sha
not medle further in the debate which was o
both hands about the year of the Kings majo
ty, or the power of the Princes of the blood i
his minority, but shal refer the Reader to th
sixth Book of the voluminous history of *Franc*
for that time, whose Author hath suppressed hi
name, where a full abstract of all the writing
that passed on both sides about these matters
set down: but this shows how little your frien
understand the History of that time, who take
for granted that *Francis* the second was then m
jor, since it was the great matter in controversy
But to proceed in my accounts.

These grounds being laid down for a war, th
Prince of *Condé*, as *Thuan* relates, would n
openly own an accession to any design, till i
should be in a good forwardness, but trusted th
management of it to one *Renaudy*, who thoug
a Catholick by his Religion, yet drew a gre
meeting of Protestants to *Nantes*, in the begi
ning of *February*, *anno* 1560. where he stirre
ther

up to arm: and in his ſpeech, after he had eſented all the grievances, he added, that the teſt ſcruples that ſtuck with many, was the gs authority, againſt which whoſo roſe he ebel: and he anſwered, acknowledging the dience due to Kings, notwithſtanding of wicked Laws; and that it was without ot, that all who reſiſted the power conſti- d by GOD, reſiſted his Ordinance: but ad- their reſiſtance was of theſe Traitors, who ng poſſeſſed themſelves of the young King, gned the ruine both of King and Kingdom. s then will clear whither they walked on the ciples of ſubjects reſiſting when perſecuted heir Soveraign, or not.

Upon this they deſigned to have ſeized on King, but as it was to be executed, though d been long carried with a marvellous ſe- y, it was at length diſcovered, and the g conveyed to *Amboiſe*: and as the Pro- nts were gathering to a head, the Kings es came upon them, and defeated and ſcat- d them. But a little after this the King , in good time for the Prince of *Condé*; for ceſſion to theſe commotions being diſco- d, he was ſeized on and ſentenced to death: he Kings death as it delivered him, did alſo n end to the queſtions about the Kings ma- y, his brother *Charles* the ninth being a child

child, ſo that the Regency was undoubte
the King of *Navarre* his right: yet not ſo enti
ly but that the other Princes were to ſhare wi
him, and the Aſſembly of the States to dir
him, as the Lawyers proved from the *Fre*
Law. The conſultation about the Proteſta
took them long up, and a ſevere Edict pa
againſt them in *July* 1561. But in the *January*
the next year a ſolemn meeting was called of
the Princes of the blood, the Privy Counſell
and the eighth Parliaments of *France*, in wh
the Edict of *January* was paſſed, giving the P
teſtants the free exerciſe of their Religion, a
all the Magiſtrats of *France* were commanded
puniſh any who interrupted or hindred this
berty, which Edict you may ſee at length, *H*
d' Aubig. lib. 2. cap. 32. But after this, as *Davila*
3. relates how the Duke of *Guiſe* coming to *P*
did diſturb a meeting of the Proteſtants, fo
it went to the throwing of ſtones, with one
which the Duke was hurt, upon which he
ſigned the breach of that Edict, and ſo was
Author and Contriver of the following wa
After this the Edict was every where violat
and the King of *Navarre* united with the C
ſtable, and the Duke of *Guiſe* for the ruin
the Proteſtants: upon which the Prince
Condé, as the next Prince of the blood, aſſer
the Edicts, ſo that the Law was on his ſide:

was the Regents power abſolute or Sove-
n: and the Prince of *Condé* in his *Manifeſto*
ared, he had armed to free the King from
captivity theſe ſtranger Princes kept him
and that his deſign was only to aſſert the au-
ity of the late Edict, which others were
ating. Upon this the wars begun, and ere
year was ended, the King of *Navarre* was
d: after which the Regency did undoubted-
long to the Prince of *Condé*. And thus you
pon what grounds theſe wars began: and if
were after that continued during the majo-
of that ſame King, and his ſucceſſors, their
in that was more to be pitied, then imita-
for it is known that wars once beginning,
jealouſies growing ſtrong, and deeply roo-
they are not eaſily ſetled.

nd to this I ſhal add what a late Writer of
Church *Sieur d'Ormegrigny* hath ſaid for
n, in his reflections on the 3. *Chapter of the*
tiques of France: wherein he juſtifies the
teſtants of *France* from theſe imputations.
at was done that way, he doth not juſtifie,
chargeth it on *the deſpair of a leſſer party*
ng them, which was diſavowed by the greater
. And ſhows how the firſt tumults in *Fran-*
he 2. his time, were carryed mainly on by
audy a Papiſt, who had aſſociats of both
igions. He vindicats what followed from
the

the intereſt the Princes of the blood had in t
Government in the minority of the Kings. A
what followed in *Henry* the 3. his time, he ſhow
was in defence of the King of *Navarre*, the rig
teous heir of the Crown, whom thoſe of t
League deſigned to ſeclude from his right. B
after that *Henry* the 4. had ſetled *France*, he n
only granted the Proteſtants free exercice
their Religion, but gave them ſome Towns f
their ſecurity, to be kept by them for twen
years: at the end whereof, the late King rem
ding them, the Proteſtants were inſtant to ke
them longer, to which he yeelded for three
four years: in end, *he wiſely determined* (ſa
that Gentle-man) *to take them out of their han*
Upon which they met in an Aſſembly at *Roch*
and *moſt imprudently*, he adds, *and againſt th*
duty, both to GOD and the King, they reſolved
keep them ſtill by force. But at that time the
was a *National Synod at Alais*, where *M.*
Moulin preſided, who ſearching into the p
ſture of affairs in that Countrey, where many
theſe places of ſtrength lay, he found the grea
and better part inclined to yeeld them up to t
King: upon which he wrote an excellent Le
ter to the *Aſſembly at Rochel*, diſſwading the
from purſuing the courſes they were ingagi
in: where he ſhows, it was *the general deſire of th*
Churches, that it might pleaſe GOD to contin
pea

e by their giving obedience to the King: and since Majesty was resolved to have these places in his hands, that they would not on that account in- in a war. But that if persecution was intended nst them, all who feared GOD desired it might r the profession of the Gospel, and so be truly the of CHRIST: and therefore assured them greater and better part of their Churches desired would dissolve their meeting, if it could be with rity to their persons. And presses their par- from that Assembly, with many arguments obviats what might be objected against it: craves pardon to tell them, *They would not inclinations in those of the Religion to obey their lutions, which many of the best quality, and grea- capacity avowedly condemned, judging that to r on that account, was not to suffer for the cause GOD.* And therefore exhorts them to de- d on GOD, and not precipitat themselves ruine by their impatience. And he ends Letter with the warmest and ferventest lan- ge imaginable for gaining them into his opi- n. It is true, his Letter wrought not the red effect, yet many upon it deserted the ting. Upon the which that Gentle-man ws, that what was then done, ought not be rged on the Protestant Churches of *France*, e it was condemned by the *National Synod of Divines*, and three parts of four who were

of

of the Religion continued in their dutiful ob
dience to the King, without ingaging in arm
with thoſe of their party. *Amirald* alſo in h
incomparable *Apology* for thoſe of the *Refor*
Religion, ſect. 2. vindicats them from the imp
tations of diſloyalty to their Prince: and af
he hath aſſerted his own opinion, that praye
and tears ought to be the only weapons of t
Church, as agreeing beſt with the nature of t
Goſpel, and the practiſe of the firſt Chriſtia
he adds his regrates, that their fathers did n
crown their other vertues with invincible p
tience, in ſuffering all the cruelty of their per
cutors without reſiſtance, after the example
the Primitive Church, by which all color of r
proaching the Reformation had been remove
Yet he ſhows how they held out during t
reign of *Francis the firſt*, *and Henry the ſecon*
notwithſtanding of all the cruelty of the per
cution, though their numbers were gre
What fell out after that, he juſtifies, or rath
excuſes (*for he ſaith, he cannot praiſe, but blame*
on the grounds we have already mentioned,
the minority of their Kings, and of the intere
of the Princes of the blood. And for the bu
neſs of *Renaudy* in *Francis* the ſeconds time, h
tells how *Calvin* diſapproved it: and obſerv
from *Thuan*, that he who firſt diſcovered it w
of the Reformed Religion, and did it pure
fro

m the dictat of his conſcience. He alſo
ws that the Proteſtants never made war with
mmon conſent, till they had the Edicts on
ir ſide, ſo that they defended the Kings Au-
rity, which others were violating. But
s withal, that the true cauſe of the wars, was
ſon of State, and a faction betwixt the houſes
Bourbon and *Guiſe*: and the defence of the
teſtants was pretended, to draw them into
And for the late wars, he charges the blame
hem on the ambition of ſome of their Gran-
s and the factious inclinations of the town of
hel. And vindicats the reſt of their Church
n acceſſion to them, whatever good wiſhes
common intereſt of their Religion might
e drawn from them, for theſe whoſe danger
y ſo much apprehended. And for the affairs
our *Britain*, which was then in a great com-
tion, for which the Proteſtants were gene-
y blamed, as if the Genius of their Reli-
n led to an oppoſition of Monarchy, he ſaith,
ngers could not well judge of matters ſo re-
e from them; but if the King of *England* was
he cõſtitutions of that kingdom a Soveraign
nce (which is a thing in which he cannot well
r a deciſion) then he ſimply condemns their
ng a war againſt him, even though that re-
t which was ſo much ſpread of his deſign
hange the Reformed Religion ſettled there,

were

were true. Neither are these opinions of *Ar-rald* to be looked on as his privat thoughts; b that Apology being published by the approb tion of these appointed to licence the books the Religion, is to be received as the more co mon and received doctrine of that Church.

And whatever approbation or assistance t neighboring Princes might have given the Pr testants in the latter or former wars, it will n inferr their allowing the precedent of subje resisting their Soveraign, though persecut by him, since it is not to be imagined ma Princes could be guilty of that. But the m xims of Princes running too commonly up grounds very different from the rules of co science, and tending chiefly to strengthen the selves, and weaken their neighbors, we are n to make any great account of their approving abetting of these wars. And thus far you ha drawn from me a great deal of discourse for j stifying the *Conformists* design of vindicati the Reformed Churches from the doctrine a practise of subjects resisting their Soveraig upon pretexts of Religion.

Isot. A little time may produce an answer all this, which I will not now attempt, but stu these accounts more accuratly. But let us no come home to *Scotland*, and examine whether t King be an accountable Prince, or not? Y

kn

ow well enough how *Fergus* was first called
r by the *Scots*, how many instances there are
he States their coërcing the King, how the
g must swear at his Coronation to observe
Laws of the Kingdom, upon which alle-
nce is sworn to him, so that if he break his
t, why are not the subjects also free, since
compact seems mutual? I need not add to
, that the King can neither make nor abrogat
ys, without the consent of the Estates of
liament, that he can impose no tax without
m. And from these things it appears that
King of *Scotland* is a limited King, who as
originally derived his power from their
ice, so is still limited by them, and liable to
n. All which is at large made out by the Au-
of *Jus populi*.

sil. Now you are on a rational point, which
knowledge deserves to be well discussed, for
the Laws of *Scotland* the King be lyable to
people, then their coërcing him will be no
llion. But this point is to be determined
from old stories, about which we have nei-
record, nor clear account for giving light
to direct our belief, nor from some tumul-
y practises, but from the Laws and Records
e Kingdom: and here the first word of our
s gives a shrewd indication that the Kings
er is not from the people, (which is *anno*

1004. according to *Sir John Skeens* collection
them:) *King Malcome gave and distributed*
his lands of the Realm of Scotland among his
and reserved nothing in property to himself but
Royal dignity, and the Mute-hill in the Town
Scone.

Now I dare appeal to any person whith
this be not the style of a Soveraign, and if
prove not the Kings title to the Crown to be
another nature, then that of a voluntary co
pact? The next vestige is to be found in
Books of *Regiam Majestatem*, held to be pub
shed by *King David* the first, *anno* 1124. and
clared authentical by following Parliame
where the third verse of the Preface is, *That*
most glorious King having the Government of
Realm, may happily live both in the time of p
and of warfare, and may rule the Realm comm
to him by GOD, who hath no Superior but the C
tor of heaven and earth, ruler over all things,
And let the plain sense of these words tell w
ther the King of *Scotland*, hath his power fr
the people, and whither he be accountable
any but to GOD? It is also clear that all w
bound to follow the King to the wars, and
nishment was decreed against these who ref
it, see the Laws of *Alexander* the second *cap.*
and *Jac.* 1. *Parl.* 1. *cap.* 4. *Jac.* 2. *p.* 13. *cap.*
And this shows they were far from allow

againſt the King. The Parliaments were originally the Kings Courts, at which all his ſals were bound to appear perſonally, and e him counſel, which proving a burden to ſmall Barons, they were diſpenced with their appearance in Parliament, 1. *Jac. Parl.* *ap.* 101. which ſhows that the coming to Parliament was looked on in theſe dayes ra- as an homage due to the King, then a pri- dge belonging to the ſubjects, otherwiſe had been loath to have parted with it ſo ea- And 2. *Jac.* 6. *Parl. cap.* 14. *It is ordained that rebel againſt the Kings perſon nor his authority, & makes ſuch rebellion is to be puniſhed after the y & quantity of ſuch rebellion by the advice of the Eſtats. And if it happens any within the Realm or notourly to rebel againſt the King, or make gainſt the Kings liedges, againſt his forbidding; in aſe the King is to gang upon them with aſſiſtance hail lands, & to puniſh them after the quantity of reſpaſ.* Here ſee who hath the Soveraign er, and whither any may take arms againſt Kings command: and the 25. *chap.* of that Parliament defines the points of Treaſon. rue by that Act theſe who aſſault caſtles, or es where the Kings perſon was, without conſent of the three Eſtates, are to be puni- as Traitors: From which one may inferr he Eſtates may beſiege the King; but it is

clear that was only a proviſion againſt t
who in the minority of the Kings uſed to ſe
upon their perſons, and ſo aſſumed the Gove
ment: and therefore it was very reaſonable
in ſuch a caſe proviſion ſhould be made, tha
were not treaſon for the Eſtates to come and
ſiege a place where the Kings perſon were
recovering him from ſuch as treaſonably ſei
on him. And this did clearly take its riſe f
the confuſions were in that Kings minor
whom ſometimes the Governor, ſometimes
Chancellor got into their keeping, & ſo car
things as they pleaſed having the young K
in their hands. The King is alſo declared
have full juriſdiction and free Empire wi
his Realm, 3. *Jac. Parl.* 5. *cap.* 30. An
along it is to be obſerved that in aſſerting
Majeſties *Prerogative Royal*, the phraſes
aſſerting and *acknowledging*, but never of *gran*
granting, are uſed, ſo that no part of the Ki
Prerogative is granted him by the Eſtates.
Jac. 6. *Parl.* 8. *cap.* 129. his Majeſties R
power and authority over all Eſtates, as well
ritual as temporal, within the Realm, is ratifi
approved, and perpetually confirmed in the
ſon of the Kings Majeſtie his heirs and ſuc
ſors. And in the 15. *Parl.* of that ſame K
chap. 251. theſe words are, *Albeit it ca*
be denyed but his Majeſtie is a free Pr

Soveraign power, having as great liberties and gatives by the Laws of this Realm and priviledge is Crown, and Diadem, as any other King, ce, or Potentat whatsoever. And in the 18. . of the same *King*, Act 1. *The Estates and e body of that present Parliament, all in one vo- r, faithful and united heart, mind and consent, ruly acknowledge his Majesties Soveraign au- y, Princely power, Royal Prerogative, and ledge of his Crown over all Estates, Persons and s within his said Kingdom.* By this time I sup- it is past debate, that by the tract of the e Laws of *Scotland*, his Majestie is a Sove- unaccountable Prince, since nothing can vised more express then are the Acts I have . For what you objected from the Coro- n Oath, remember what was said a great e ago, that if by the Coronation the King his power, so that the Coronation Oath, Oath of Allegiance were of the nature of a al stipulation, then you might with some n inferr that a failing of the one side, did the other; but nothing of that can be alled- here, where the King hath his Authority, soon the breath of his Father goes out, and with full Regal power before he be crow- so that the Coronation is only a solemn in- ration in that which is already his right. , let me tell you, that the Kings swearing

at his Coronation, is but a late practiſe; and
the title of the *Kings* of *Scotland* to the Crow
is not upon the ſwearing of that Oath: A
here I ſhal tell you all that I can find in our La
of the *Kings* ſwearing or promiſing. The fi
inſtance that meets me is *chap.* 17. of the St
tuts of *King Robert* the ſecond, where the
words are, *For fulfilling and obſerving of all t
premiſes, the King ſo far as concerns him in
Parliament, hath obliged himſelf in the word o
Prince, and his ſon the Earl of Carrict* (afte
wards *Robert* the third) *being conſtituted by t
King for fulfilling of the premiſes, ſo far as t
ches him, gave and made his Oath, the holy Evan
gils being touched by him, and then the States
Parliament did alſo ſwear to maintain the Earl
Carrict*, made then Lieutenant under the *Kin*
Now the reaſon why theſe mutual Oaths we
then given, is well known, ſince the *Kin*
ſucceſſion was ſo doubtful. But after that,
Oath ſeems to have been given: & though *Ki
James* the ſecond his Coronation be ſet down
the Records of Parliament, there is not a wo
of an Oath given by any in his name. It is tr
in the 11. *Parl.* of that King, *cap.* 41. for ſec
ring of the Crown-lands from being alienate
it is appointed, *That the King who then was, ſho
be ſworn; and in like manner all his ſucceſſors Ki
of Scotland into their Coronation, to the keeping of t
S*

tut, and all the points thereof. But this is not ch an Oath as you alledge. Likewiſe in King *mes* the fourth his reign, 2. *Parl. chap.* 12. here the Counſel was ſworn, it is added, *And r Soveraign Lord hath humbled his Highneſs to omit and grant in Parliament, to abide and remain heir Counſels while the next Parliament.* But it to be obſerved, the King was then but 17. ars old, and ſo not of full age: this promiſe s alſo a temporary proviſion. Beſides, the ve- ſtyle of it ſhows, that it was below his Maje- to be ſo bound. But the firſt Act for a Co- nation Oath I can meet with, is *Cap.* 8. of the *Parl.* of King *James* the ſixth, *anno* 1567. here the ſtyle wherein the Act runs, ſhows it s a new thing, it bearing no narrative of any ch former cuſtom: the words of the Act are, *m, becauſe that the increaſe of vertue and ſuppreſ- g of Idolatry craves, that the Prince and the people of one perfect Religion, which of GODS mercy now preſently profeſſed within this Realm; There- re it is ſtatute and ordained by our Soveraign Lord, Lord Regent, and the three Eſtats of this preſent arliament, that all Kings and Princes, or Magi- ats whatſoever, holding their place, which hereafter y happen to reign, and bear rule over this Realm, the time of their Coronation, and receipt of their ncely authority, make their faithful promiſe by th, &c.* Now you ſee the beginning of the

Coronation Oath, and I need not here refle
the time when that Act paſſed, it being ſo
vious to every one. But I ſuppoſe it is
out, that the *Kings* of *Scotland* have not
authority from any ſtipulation uſed at thei
ronation. The next thing you alledge to p
the *King* of *Scotland* a limited Prince, is
cauſe he muſt govern by laws, which cann
enacted without the authority of the three
in Parliament: But this will not ſerve turn
leſs you prove that the Eſtats can cognoſ
the *King*, and coërce him if he tranſgreſs
which there is not a title in our Laws.
knowledge the conſtitution of Parliamen
be both a rational and excellent model, an
the *King* becomes a Tyrant when he vi
their Priviledges, and governs without
But though his Miniſters who ſerve him i
tyrannical ways are lyable to puniſhment
Law, yet himſelf is ſubject to none but G
And from our *Kings* their Juſtice and goo
in governing legally by the Counſels of
Parliaments, you have no reaſon to argue a
their abſolut authority; for their binding
ſelves to ſuch rules, and being tyed to t
ſervance of Laws enacted by themſelves
never overthrow their authority, but
commend it, as having ſuch a temperat
Soveraignity, Juſtice, and goodneſs in it.

Scot. But was not King *James* the third reſi-
and killed in the field of *Striveling*, and af-
wards in his ſons firſt *Parl. Act.* 14. all who
re againſt him in that field, were declared in-
cent, and his ſlaughter was declared to be his
n fault, which was never reſcinded? As alſo
. 130. of *Jac.* 6. *Parl.* 8. the honor and au-
rity of Parliament upon the free vote of the
ee Eſtats thereof is aſſerted? And are not
an impugner of the authority of the three
ats, who plead thus for the *K*ings Soveraign
wer? *See Anſwer to the Letter written to the*
thor of Jus Populi.

Baſil. I ſhal not engage far in the Story of
ng *James* the third, which even as it is repre-
ted by *Buchanan, lib.* 11. (no friend to Mo-
rchy) is very far from being juſtifiable on
e ſide of thoſe who fought againſt him: nor
s it the leaſt part of their guilt, that they for-
d his ſon, being then but fifteen years old, to
n their rebellion: And what wonder was it,
at they who had killed the father, and kept
s ſon in their power, paſſed ſuch an Act in
eir own favors? But *K*ing *James* the fourth
ickly diſcovered what a ſincere Penitent he
s for his acceſſion to that Rebellion, as ap-
ared by the iron belt he wore all his life, as a
nance for this ſin: yet the meekneſs of his
irit, and the power of that faction, made that

things

things continued in the poſture they forme
were in. It is true, that Act was not expre
repelled, which perhaps was not ſafe at th
time to have attempted: but it was really de
by his Revocation ratified in his 6. *Parl.* c
100. wherein with conſent of the three Eſta
He annulls and revokes all Statuts and Acts of P
liament which he had inacted in his former years, t
tended either to the prejudice of the Catholick Churc
his ſoul, or of the Crown, declaring them to have
force, but to be deleted, and cancelled out of the boo
And it is not to be doubted, but in this he h
an eye to that former Act: but for your Act
ſerting the authority of Parliament, look b
what immediatly preceeds it, and you will fi
the *K*ings Authority and Supremacy fully e
bliſhed: and I acknowledge, that whoſoev
impugnes the authority of Parliament, as t
*K*ings Great Counſel, doth incur a very hig
puniſhment; but this will never prove an Auth
rity in the States to coërce and reſiſt the *Kin*
One thing I muſt mind you of from that A
which is, *That none of the Liedges muſt preſu*
to impugn the dignity and authority of the ſa
three Eſtats, or to ſeek or procure the innovation,
diminution of the Power and Authority of the ſa
three Eſtats, or any of them in time coming, un
the pain of treaſon. And can you be ſo ignora
of our Laws, as not to know that the Chur

s one of theſe Eſtates: for the ſmal Barons ich ſome called the third Eſtate, came not in three years after? *Jac. 6. Parl. 11. cap. 113.* d now from all theſe premiſes, I think we may rly inferr with *Sir John Skeen*, *Title* 8. of the ads of our Laws drawn up by him, *That all riſdiction ſtands and conſiſts in the Kings perſon by ſon of his Royal Authority and Crown, and is mpetent to no ſubject, but flows and proceeds m the King, having ſupream juriſdiction, and is ven and committed by him to ſuch ſubjects as he eaſes.*

Eud. I muſt confeſs my ſelf pleaſed with this ſcuſſion of theſe points you have been toſſing nong you: and though I have ſate ſilent, yet I ve followed the threed of all your diſcourſe ith much cloſe attention; and was mightily nfirmed in my former perſwaſion, both by e evidence of Reaſon, the authorities of ripture, and theſe inſtances of Hiſtory were duced. But there are many other things yet be talked of, though I confeſs this be of the reateſt importance: and the ſatisfaction I have ceived in this, makes me long to hear you andle the other matters in debate.

Phil. I ſuppoſe we have forgot little that be-nged to this queſtion: but for ingaging fur-her at this time, I have no mind to it, it being o long paſſed midnight: we ſhal therefore give

give some truce to our debates, and retur
upon the next appointment.

End. I were unworthy of the kindness yo
show me, did I importune you too much: bu
I will presume upon your friendship for me
to expect your company to morrow at the same
hour you did me the favor to come here t
day.

Isot. I shal not fail to keep your hour, though
I be hardly beset in such a croud of Assailants,
but truth is on my side, and it is great, and sha
prevail, therefore good night to you.

Basil. I see you are not shaken out of you
confidence for all the foils you get, yet our
next dayes discourse will perhaps humble you
a little more; but I referr this to the appoint-
ment wherein we hope to meet again, and so
Adieu.

End. Adieu, to you all, my good friends.

THE

THE SECOND CONFERENCE.

Eudaimon.



OU are again welcome to this place, and ſo much the more, that your ſtaying ſome minutes later then the appointment, was making me doubt of your coming: and indeed this delay proved more tedious, and ſeemed longer to me then the many hours were beſtowed on your yeſterdays conference: but me thinks, *Iſotimus*, your looks, though never very ſerene, have an unuſual cloud upon them; I doubt you have been among the *Brother-hood*, whom your ingenious relation of what paſſed here, hath offended. Their temper is pretty well known to us all, ſome of them being *as the peſtilence that walketh in darkneſs*, in corners, with the no leſs zealous, but ſcarcely more ignorant, *ſiſter-hood*, they vent

vent their pedling ſtuff; but of all things in the world ſhun moſt to engage with any that can unmask them, and diſcover their follies. And their ſafeſt way of dealing with ſuch perſons is to laugh at them, or ſolemnly to pitty them with a diſdainful brow. And that is the beſt refutation they will beſtow on the ſolideſt reaſon; or if any of them yelp out with an anſwer, ſenſe or non-ſenſe, all is alike; the premiſes are never examined, only if the concluſion be poſitively vouched, as clearly proven from Scriptures and reaſon, the ſentence is irreverſible paſt, and you may as ſoon bow an oak of an hundred years old, as deal with ſo much ſupercilious ignorance. Tell plainly, have you been in any ſuch company?

Iſot. What wild extravagant ſtuff powr you out on better men then your ſelf? but I pitty your ignorance who know not ſome of theſe precious Worthies, whoſe ſhoe latchets you are not worthy to unlooſe. But the truth is, you have got me here among you, and bait me by turns, either to eaſe your own galls, or to try mine; yet it is needleſs to attempt upon me, for as I am not convinced by your reaſons, ſo I will not be behind with you in reflections: and I will crow and fight both, as a cock of the game.

Baſ. Hold, hold, for theſe ſerve to no uſe but to ranckle

kle peeviſh humors, I will therefore engage
in another ſubject about the Civil Authori-
which our yeſterdayes debate left untou-
d; which is *the obedience due to their Com-*
nds: let us therefore conſider how far ſubjection
geth us to obey the laws of the Civil Powers.

Iſot. Had you not enough of that yeſter-
? Is it not enough that the Magiſtrat be not
iſted? but will not that ſerve turn with you?
do you deſign that we ſurrender our con-
ences to him, and obey all his Laws, good
bad, and follow *Leviathans* doctrine of em-
cing the Magiſtrats faith without enquiry?
ich is bravely aſſerted by the *Author of Eccle-*
ical Policy. This is indeed to make the King
GODS ſtead, and to render *Ceſar* the
ngs that are GODS, which is a viſible de-
n either for Popery or Atheiſm.

Philar. Truly, Sir, you conſider little, if
u judge ſubmiſſion to the penalties of the
ws, to be all the duty we owe Superiors. It
true; where the Legiſlators leave it to the
bjects choice, either to do a thing enacted,
to pay a fine; in that caſe, obedience is not
nply required; ſo that he who pays the mulct,
fills his obligation. But where a Law is ſim-
y made, and obedience enjoyned, and a pe-
lty fixed on diſobedience, in that caſe, no-
ing but the ſinfulneſs of the command can
excuſe

excuſe our diſobedience: neither can it be ſai
that he ſins not who is content to ſubmit to t
puniſhment, ſince by the ſame method of a
guing you may prove that ſuch horrid Atheiſt
as ſay they are content to be damned, do not ſ
againſt GOD, ſince they are willing to ſu
mit to the threatned puniſhment. The rig
of exacting our obedience is therefore to be d
ſtinguiſhed from the power of puniſhing o
faults. And as we have already conſidered ho
far the latter is to be acquieſced in, it remai
to be examined what is due to the former. B
here I lay down for a principle, *That whatever*
determined by the Law of GOD, cannot be reve
ſed, nor countermanded by any humane Law: Fo
the Powers that are, being ordained of GOD
and they being his Miniſters, do act as his De
puties: and the ty which lyes on us to obe
GOD, being the foundation of our ſubjectio
to them, it cannot bind us to that which over
throws its ſelf: Therefore it is certain GOD
is firſt to be obeyed; and all the Laws of me
which contradict his Authority or Command
are null, and void of all obligation on our obe
dience: but I muſt add, it is one of the arts o
you know whom, to faſten tenets on men wh
judge theſe tenets worthy of the higheſt *Ana*
thema. For if it be maintained, that the Magi
ſtrat can bind obligations on our conſciences
the

n it will be told in every Conventicle, that
e a new tyranny is brought upon ſouls, which
GODS prerogative, though this be no-
ng more then to ſay we ought *to be ſubject for*
ſcience ſake. If again it be proved that the
ermining of the externals of Government or
orſhip, falls within the Magiſtrats Sphere,
n comes in a new complaint, and it is told,
t here Religion is given up to the luſts and
aſure of men, though it be an hundred times
eated, that command what the King will in
judice of the divine Law, no obedience is
. If again it be proved that Church Judi-
ories, in what notions ſoever, are ſubjects, as
l as others, and no leſs tyed to obedience
n others; upon this come in vehement out-
es, as if the Throne and Kingdom of
RIST were over-turned and betrayed,
h other ſuch like expreſſions in their harſh
e. What is become of mankind and of Re-
on, when ignorants triumph upon theſe bar-
pretences, as if they were the only Maſters
eaſon, and directors of conſcience? You
w what my temper is in moſt differences:
I acknowledge my mind to be full of a juſt
lain of theſe ignorant, and inſolent Pedlers;
ch is the more enflamed, when I conſider
ruines, not only of ſound learning, but of
piety, and the common rules of humanity,

which follow theſe ſimple conteſts they ma
about nothing.

Baſil. To ſpeak freely, I cheriſh reflectio
no where, therefore I ſhal not conceal my m
like of theſe invectives, which though I am f
ced to confeſs, are juſt; yet I love to hear tr
and peace pleaded for with a calm ſerene te
per: and though the intolerable and pier
railings of theſe Pamphlets do juſtify a ſev
procedure, yet I would have the ſofter and m
der methods of the Goſpel uſed, that ſo we m
overcome evil with good To take you therefo
off that angry engagement, let me invite you
a ſober examen of the Magiſtrats authority
things divine. But before this be engaged
let it be firſt conſidered whither there be a
Legiſlative Power on earth about things ſacr
and next, with whom it is lodged.

Iſot. I will ſo far comply with your deſi
that for this once without retaliating, I quit
Philarcheus the laſt word of ſcolding. But
come to the purpoſe you have ſuggeſted, co
der that CHRIST hath given us a comp
rule, wherein *are all things that pertain to lif*
godlineſs. It is then an imputation on his Go
to ſay any thing needs be added to it, and
it contains not a clear direction for all thi
therefore they accuſe his wiſdom or goodn
who pretend to add to his Laws, and whe

hath not burdened our conſciences: what ranny is it to bind *a yoak upon us which our Fa-rs were not able to bear?* Whereby as our riſtian liberty is invaded, ſo innumerable hiſmes and ſcandals ſpring from no other ng ſo much, as from theſe oppreſſions of nſcience, which are ſo much the more unjuſt, t the impoſers acknowledging their indiffe-cy, and the refuſers ſcrupuling their lawful-s, the peace of the Church is ſacrificed to at is acknowledged indifferent: neither can bounds be fixed to thoſe impoſitions; for if particular may be added, why not more more ſtill, till the yoak become heavier then of *Moſes* was? which is made out from ex-ience: For the humor of innovating in di-matters having once crept into the Church, ever ſtopt till it ſwelled to that prodigious of Rites, under which the *Roman Church* oppreſſed. And beſides all theſe general iderations, there is one particular againſt ificant Rites, which is, that the inſtituting hem in order to a particular ſignification of grace, makes them Sacraments, according e vulgar definition of Sacraments, that they he outward ſignes of an inward grace: but nſtituting of Sacraments, is by the confeſ-of all, a part of CHRISTS prerogative, he who confers grace, can only inſtitut the

ſignes of it. Upon all theſe accounts, I ple
the rule of Scripture to be that which ought
determine about all divine matters, and that
binding Laws ought to be made in divine thin
wherein we are left at liberty by GOD, w
is the only Maſter of our conſciences. *See fu*
pag. 172. *to pag.* 180.

Phil. You have now given me a full bro
ſide, after which I doubt not but you triumph
if you had ſhattered me all to pieces: but I
afraid you ſhal find this voley of chained b
hath quite miſſed me, & that I be aboard of
ere you be aware. No man can with more hea
neſs acknowledge the compleatneſs of Scr
ture then my ſelf: and one part of it is, that
things which tend to order, edification a
peace be done, and the ſcene of the world a
ring ſo, that what now tends to advance ord
edification, and peace, may afterwards oc
ſion diſorder, deſtruction and contention,
Scripture had not been compleat, if in th
things there were not an authority on earth
make and unmake Laws in things indiffer
I acknowledge the *adding of new pieces of wor*
hath ſo many inconveniencies hanging abou
that I ſhould not much patronize it; but the
termining of what may be done, either in
or that faſhion to any particular rule, is no
that nature: Therefore, ſince Worſhip mu

certain poſture, a certain habit, in a deter-
nat place, and on ſuch times, all theſe being
one kind; Laws made about them upon the
ounts of order, edification, or peace, do not
tend to prejudge the perfection of Scrip-
e, by any additions to what it preſcribes,
e no new thing is introduced: Indeed did
nane Law-givers pretend that by their Laws
ſe things became of their own nature more
eptable to GOD, they ſhould invade
DS prerogative; but when they are pre-
bed only upon the account of decency and
r, it is intolerable pieviſhneſs to call a thing
fferent of its nature, unlawful, becauſe com-
nded: For the Chriſtian liberty conſiſts in
exemption of our conſciences from all hu-
e yoak, but not of our actions, which are
in the power of our Superiors, till they en-
n what is ſinful, and then a greater then they
be obeyed. I acknowledge, the ſimplici-
f the *Chriſtian Religion* is one of its chief
ies, nothing being enjoyned in it but what
oſt properly fitted for advancing the ſouls
nen towards that wherein their bleſſedneſs
n conſiſt: And therefore I never reflect with-
wonder, on that cenſure *Ammian Mar-*
i, a Heathen Writer, gives of *Conſtantius*,
t he confounded the Chriſtian Religion, which was
s ſelf pure and ſimple, with doting ſuperſtitions.

So I freely acknowledge that whoſoever intro-
duce new parts of Worſhip, as if they cou-
commend us to GOD, do highly encroa-
on GODS authority, and mans liberty. B-
as for the determining of things that may
done in a variety of wayes into one particu-
form, ſuch as the preſcribing a ſet form i-
Worſhip, the ordering the poſture in Sacr-
ments, the habit in Worſhip, determinat tim-
for commemorating great mercies, the ti-
how long a ſinner muſt declare his penitenc-
ere he be admitted to the uſe of the Sacramen-
and the like (which is all in queſtion among u-
they are quite of another nature. And it i-
ſtrange piece of nicety, if in theſe things, b-
cauſe Superiors command what ſeems moſt pr-
per for expreſſing the inward ſenſe we ought
have of things, that therefore theſe injunctio-
become criminal, and not to be obeyed. F-
the ſignificancy alledged to be in them, is onl-
dumb way of expreſſing our inward thought
and as we agree to expreſs them by words,
ſome outward ſignes may be alſo uſed: as
ſackcloth the penitent expreſſeth his ſorro-
and by a ſurplice a Church-man expreſſeth
purity; ſo thoſe habits are only a ſilent way
ſpeaking out the ſenſe of the heart. Only h-
on the way, if you have a mind to eaſe yo-
ſpleen a little, read what that late Pamph-
fa-

th, to prove a diſtinction betwixt theſe two remonies, *Pag.* 111. That vulgar Sophiſm of king Sacraments, is the pooreſt cavil imagi-ble: for a Sacrament is a federat Rite of ſti-lating with GOD, wherein as we plight r faith to GOD, ſo he viſibly makes offer his Goſpel to us, which he accompagnies th the gracious effuſions of his Spirit: and deed to inſtitut any ſuch Rite, were the gheſt encroachment on the divine Authority: t what Sophiſtry will faſten a pretenſion to is on the inſtitution of a Rite, which ſhal only nifie that duty a creature owes his Maker and edeemer, tending both to quicken the perſon at performes it to a ſenſe of it, as alſo to work on Spectators by ſuch a grave ſolemn Rite? o ſay men can inſtitut means of conveying the vine grace, is juſtly to be condemned; but how differs it from that, to uſe ſignes, as well as ords, for expreſſing our duty to GOD? hus you ſee how ill founded that pompous ar-ment is, with which we have heard many iumphing among ignorants, or where none uld contradict them.

Crit. If I may have liberty to add a little, I uld ſuggeſt ſomewhat of the true notion of *hriſtian Liberty*, and how it is to be made uſe of, reſtrained. For the clearing whereof, we are call to mind how upon the firſt promulgation

of the Goſpel, a contention did early riſe abo
the obſervation of *Moſes Law*, the ſtipulati
whereto was given in Circumciſion; the *Juda*
zers pleaded its continuance, and the *Apoſtl*
aſſerted the *Chriſtian Liberty*: the *Judaizers* pre
tended a divine obligation from *Moſes his La*
the *Apoſtles* proved that was now vacated by th
death of CHRIST, which freed all fro
that yoak, and that therefore to be circumciſe
as a ſtipulation to *Moſes Law*, was to contin
ſubject to that yoak, and ſo to deny the *Meſſ*
was yet come, by which CHRIST ſhoul
profit them nothing. But the authority o
Paul and *Barnabas* not being great enough t
ſettle that queſtion, they were ſent from *An*
tioch to the *Apoſtles*, and *Presbyters* at *Jeruſalem*,
who determined againſt the neceſſity of Cir
cumciſion, and conſequently of the obſervation
of the *Moſaical Law*, and appointed tha
theſe who were proſelyted from *Gentiliſm* to
the *Chriſtian Faith*, ſhould be received, not a
Proſelytes of Juſtice, but as *Proſelytes of the Gate*
who were only bound to obey the ſeven Pre
cepts of the ſons of *Noah*; which I ſtand not to
make out, it being ſufficiently cleared alread
by others. Here then the *Chriſtian Liberty* wa
ſtated in an exemption from *the Law of Moſes*.
But for all this, we ſee into what complyance
the *Apoſtles* conſented, for gaining upon the

Jews

s by that condeſcention, they circumciſe, y purifie (which was done by ſprinkling h the aſhes of the red Cow) they take the rs of *Nazariſm*, they keep the Feaſts at *Jeru-m* (which I wonder how that Pamphleter ld deny, *Pag.*301. it being mentioned ex-ſly, *Acts* 18. 21.) and upon the whole mat-S. *Paul* gives the following rules and aſſer-ns.

The firſt was, that theſe things did not com-nd a man to GOD: *For the Kingdom of D conſiſted not in meat and drink*, (which arly relates to the *Moſaical* differencing of ats, clean an unclean) *that neither circumciſion, uncircumciſion availed any thing.* And if nei-r branch of that controverſie did of its own ure commend men to GOD; what judge-nts may we paſs on our triffling wranglings? ence we may inferr, that we ought to in-ct all *Chriſtians in the Faith*, but not in theſe btful diſputations.

The next aſſertion is, that even in theſe mat-men might be acceptable to GOD, on ich ſide ſoever they were, ſo they judged at they did was done to GOD. He that e diſtinction of days, or meats, *made it to the R D: and he that regarded them not to the R D, he regarded them not.* So that GOD be acceptably ſerved by ſeveral men doing

doing things contrary one to another.

Another rule is, that in theſe things ev man muſt be fully perſwaded in his own mi and proceed out of a clear conviction in his c ſcience.

A fourth rule is, that in theſe matters no ought to preſcribe or dictat to another: ſuch had a liberty in them, were not to deſpiſe ſcrupulous, as unreaſonable; neither were th who ſcrupuled at them, to judge ſuch as ac in a higher Sphere of liberty, as profane or cencious: ſo that all were to be remitted *GODS Judgement Seat.*

Another rule is, that for *the Peace of Church*, many things which are otherwiſe ſu ject to great inconveniencies, may be done the gaining our brethren: but if ſuch co plyance harden people in their imperious h mor, what was formerly to be done for gainin upon them, becomes unfit when ſo abuſed them: and therefore if after we have comply with the weak exceptions of others, in matte indifferent, they become ſo hardy as to preſum upon our goodneſs to invade our liberty, enjoying ſuch things as neceſſary, pretendi to an authority over us; *we are not to give place ſubjection to ſuch, no not for an hour.*

The laſt rule is, that in matters of indiffere cy, we are to poſtpone our own inclinations deſi

gres, when the hazard of our brothers ſtum-
ng, or of the peace of the Church lyes in our
y.

All theſe are ſo clearly aſſerted by *S. Paul*,
withall are ſo oppoſit to our preſent heats,
t I wiſh they were more minded by the trou-
rs of our *Iſrael*, and they would certainly
e a ſpeedy deciſion to theſe feuds about
ubtful diſputatiõs which have ſo long preyed
the *Peace of the Church*.

Baſil. And I am ſure if ſo great a complyance
y be given to the weakneſs of our brethren,
ch more is due to the commands of our Su-
riors; except you ſay, we are more ſubject to
uals then to Superiors, or that the weakneſs
a brother ſhould weigh more then the autho-
y of a father: And in fine, that the obliga-
ns of *Charity* ſhould be more prevalent then
oſe of *Juſtice*; *Obedience* being a debt we owe,
hereas *Complyance* is a benevolence given. I
not deny but great caution and tenderneſs
uſt be uſed in making of ſuch Laws, and that
eir fitneſs for attaining the ends of *order*, *edi-
ation and peace*, ſhould be well conſidered,
d they no longer adhered to, then theſe effects
n be drawn from them: ſo that if the nature
circumſtances which vary all things indiffe-
nt, come to change, the ſame reaſon that exa-
ed their being firſt impoſed, will plead a
change.

change. I alſo acknowledge, that great abu
hath followed upon the innovating and prefe
bing in *divine matters*, and that nothing hath o
caſioned more *diviſions among Chriſtians*, then
overſtraining an *uniformity*. But if becauſe
abuſes you over-turn all *Legiſlative Power* i
matters ſacred, nothing that is humane ſha
ſcape your fury, ſince every thing is ſubject
abuſe. And nothing will curb ones carreer
he turn *Quaker*, that follows theſe maxims
But one thing is ſtill forgotten, that the *dicta*
of Reaſon are in their kind the *voyce of GOD*
reaſon being nothing, ſave an impreſs of th
Image of GOD on the ſoul of man; which be
cauſe much obliterated by the fall, was to b
ſupplyed by revelation: but wherein it remain
clear, its directions not contradicting any poſi
tive or revealed Law, are ſtill to be followed a
the Laws of GOD.

Poly. For proving all this, I ſhal not run ſo
far back as to examine the nature of the *Prie*
hood, and Sacrifices were before Moſes, to conſi
der whither theſe flowed from a *revelation* con
veyed by *tradition*, or from the *dictats of reaſon*
But after *Moſes his Law* was given, wherein
all was modelled by *divine preſcript*, yet what
vaſt heap of *additions* did flow upon that worſhip
before our Saviors days, all that have written
on the Temple-ſervice do abundantly diſcover

Here

ere is a field ſpacious enough for any that de-
ned a vain ſhow of much reading, but a view
Doctor Lightfoots Temple-ſervice will quickly
nvince any, that the whole ſervice of the
emple was interpalated by many additions,
hoſe firſt Author cannot be traced. They alſo
ed *Baptiſm* to all were proſelyted from *Gen-*
iſm. And in the *Paſchal feſtivity* alone, how
any new Rites do we find? Every ſchool-boy
ay know that they had a diſh, called *Charaſeth*,
hich was a thick ſawce of Dates, Figs, Al-
onds, &c. pounded together, which looked
ke clay, to mind them of the clay in which
eir Fathers wrought in *Egypt*, which was a
gnificative ceremony; and was the diſh where-
they dipped their hand, which we find was
ot wanting in our LORDS Paſsover; which
roves ſignificant Rites, though of humane ap-
ointment, cannot be criminal. And if to this
ſhould add the ſeveral cups of wine, the di-
erſe removes of the Table, and covering it of
ew, the frequent waſhing of their hands, and
iverſe other things, I ſhould grow tedious.
ut our LORD never reproves theſe things;
ay, on the contrary he ſymbolized with them.
t is true, when their zeal for their *traditions* made
hem break the *Commandments of GOD*, or
dhere ſo ſtifly to them, as to judge the con-
ciences of ſuch as did not comply with them in

the

the uſe of them, then he checks their hypoc
ſie, and accuſes them, not for the uſe of th
things, but becauſe they placed all Religion
them, and impoſed the Precepts of men as d
ctrines. To this I might add the whole fra
of the *Synagogues*, both as to *Government*, *Di*
plin and Worſhip: for whatſoever ſcrapes m
be brought which may ſeem to prove there w
Synagogues before the captivity, which ye
much controverted; yet the form of *governm*
in them, the rules of *excommunication*, and its d
grees, together with their *Philacteries*, and
forms of worſhip, will never be *proved from Scr*
ture. Now ſince the *Law of* GOD was
leſs perfect in the *Old Diſpenſation*, then th
Goſpel is now, it will follow that *additions* i
things purely external and ritual, do no way de
tract from the Word of GOD: For nothin
can be brought to prove the *New Teſtament*
compleat rule for *Chriſtians*, which will no
plead the ſame full authority to the *Old Teſta*
ment, during that *Diſpenſation*; ſince though th
Diſpenſation was imperfect, yet the revelatio
of GOD to them was *able to make them perfe*
and throughly furniſhed for every good work: and
the *Scriptures* which *S. Paul* ſaith, *were able t*
make wiſe to ſalvation, can be no other the
the *Old Teſtament writings*. For beſides that by
Scriptures nothing elſe is underſtood in the *New*

Teſta

ament, there could be no other *Scripture* own to *Timothy* of a child, but these of the *Old stament*. If then they trespass upon the au-rity of the *New Testament*, and its blessed thor; who assert a power to determine about tuals in Worship, or other matters of *Religion*, y committed the same crime who pretended add to what *Moses* prescribed, since he s also *faithful in all his house*. Or if any plead divine warrant for these institutions which re traditionally conveyed, this will open a or for all the pretences of the *Roman Church*, ce the expressions that cancel *traditions*, are as l in the *Old Testament*, as in the *New*. And s far I think I have evinced, that there were eat additions in Rituals made by the *Jews*, d that these were not unlawful, since com-yed with by him who never did amiss, and t these could have no higher original then hu-ane authority. I go on to the *New Dispensa-n*, wherein I doubt not to evince, that as for uals, most of these they found in the *Synagogue* re retained, without any other change then hat that *Dispensation* drew after it, and that ey took both the rules of government, wor-ip and discipline from the *Synagogue*. There-re the *Epistles* do not, when treating of these atters, speak in their style, who are institu-g new things; but of those who are giving

dire-

directions about what was already received and known: For if new rules had been to be delivered, the inſtitution had been expreſs, either in the *Goſpels*, *Acts*, or *Epiſtles*. Now if any will read theſe without prejudice, no ſuch thing will appear: of which manner of ſtyle, no account can be given; but that things, as to Rituals continued as they were, the uſe of the Sacrements being only inſtituted by CHRIST, where the language of an inſtitution is expreſs.

About two hundred years after CHRIST outward penitence was brogh into the Church and ſcandalous perſons were, according to the nature of ſcandals, debarred from the Sacrament for a long ſpace, and were by degrees, and according to the hight of their penitence, received to the Communion of the Church, but not after ſome years had paſſed in outward profeſſions of penitence: and the modelling of this became after that, the chief care of *Synods* for diverſe Centuries. Now if one will argue, that though it be true that a ſcandalous perſon ſhould be excommunicated; yet ſince GOD hath mercy at whatſoever time a ſinner repents, why ſhould the Church (which only judgeth of the profeſſion) forgive at whatſoever time one profeſſeth penitence. It will not be eaſie in your principles to anſwer this: and ſee how you will clear this practiſe of Diſcipline from tyranny

ſinc

ce to debar men from the *Sacraments*, is a grea- dominion over conſciences then the deter- ning about Rituals.

But to come nearer home, there was a certain ciety you have heard of *ycleped the Kirk*, which d diverſe Books of Diſcipline containing les for that, and a Directory for Worſhip, hich had no few rules neither: they had alſo a me of Government, the Supream Judicatory ereof was compoſed of three Miniſters, and e ruling Elder from each Presbytery, a ru- g Elder beſide from each Burrough, two ing allowed the Metropolis, and a Commiſ- ner was ſent from each Univerſity; and in s high Court the King came in with the pri- edge of a Burgh: for though the Metropolis d two, he was allowed to ſend but one with a gle ſuffrage to repreſent him; and this Court tended to an authority from CHRIST, d their authority was ſacred with no leſs cer- icat, then *he that deſpiſeth you, deſpiſeth me.* w how a power can be commi[illegible]ed to dele- s without any Commiſſion for it from the Su- ior, will not be eaſily made out. And they l ſearch long ere they find a divine warrant this Court, unleſs they vouch *Mary Mit- lſons teſtimony* for it, whoſe hyſterical diſtem- s were given out for Propheſies. And where- hey are ſo tender of *Chriſtian Liberty*, that no

Law muſt paſs about the Rituals of Religion, ye their books of diſciplin & model of governme were not only ſettled by Law, but afterward ſworn to be maintained in the Covenant, where in they ſwore *the preſervation of the Reformed Religion in Scotland, in Doctrine, Worſhip, Diſcipline and Government.* Theſe were the tender conſciences that could not hear of any Law in *matters indifferent*, and yet would have all ſwear their forms, many of which they could not but know were indifferent: which was a making them neceſſary at another rate, then is done by a Law which the Legiſlator can repeal when he will: and never were any in the world more addicted to their own forms then they were. An inſtance of this I will give, which I dare ſay will ſurpriſe you: When ſome deſigners for popularity in the *Weſtern* parts of that Kirk, did begin to diſuſe the *LORDS Prayer* in worſhip, and the ſinging the *Concluſion* or *Doxologie* after the *Pſalm*, and *the Miniſters kneeling for privat devotion* when he entred the Pulpit, the *General Aſſembly* took this in very ill part, and in a Letter they wrote to the Presbyteries, complained falſly *Of a ſpirit of innovation was beginning to get in the Kirk, and to throw theſe laudible practiſes out of it, mentioning the three I named, which are commanded to be ſtill practiſed; and ſuch as refuſed obedience are appointed to be conferred with in order to* gi

ving of them ſatisfaction: and if they continued un-
actable, the Presbyteries were to proceed againſt
em, as they ſhould be anſwerable to the next General
ſſembly. This Letter I can produce authenti-
lly atteſted. But is it not ſtrange, that ſome
ho were then zealous to condemn theſe inno-
tions, ſhould now be carried with the herd to
guilty of them? I am become hoarſe with
eaking ſo long, and ſo I muſt break off, ha-
ng, as I ſuppoſe, given many great precedents
om Hiſtory for the uſing of *Rites in divine mat-*
s, without an expreſs warrant, and for *paſſing*
ws upon theſe, and have cleared the one of
perſtition, and the other of Tyranny.

Eud. Truly, all of you have done your parts
well, that even *Iſotimus* himſelf ſeems half
nvinced: It is then fully clear, that as no-
ng is to be obtruded on our belief without
ar revelation; ſo no ſacred duty can be bound
our obedience without a divine warrant:
in Rituals, eſpecially in determining what
y be done in a variety of ways to one particu-
form, there hath been, and ſtill muſt be, a
wer on earth; which provided it ballance all
ngs right, and conſider well the fitneſs of
ſe Rites, for attaining the deſigned end, doth
invade GODS Dominion by making
ws about them: Nor will the pretence of
riſtian Liberty warrant our diſobedience to

them. It remains to be conſidered, who are veſted with this Power, and how much of it belongs to the Magiſtrat, and how much to the Church?

Baſil. I now engage in a Theam which may perhaps lay me open to cenſure, as if I were courting the Civil Powers by the aſſerting of their rights: but I am too well known to you to dread your jealouſly much in this; and I am too little known to my ſelf, if flattery be my foible. I ſhal therefore with the greateſt frankneſs and ingenuity, lay open my ſenſe of this matter, with the reaſons that prevail with me in it: but I deſire firſt to hear *Iſotimus* his opinion about it.

Iſot. I do not deny the King hath authority and juriſdiction in matters ſacred: but it muſt be aſſerted in a due line of ſubordination: Firſt to CHRIST the King of Kings, and the only head of his Church. And next, to the Rulers and Office-bearers of the Church, who are entruſted by CHRIST, as his Ambaſſadors with the ſouls of their flocks, and who muſt give him an account of their labors; therefore they muſt have their rules only from him who empowers them, and to whom they are ſubject. They muſt alſo have a power among them to preſerve the *Chriſtian Society*; in order to which they muſt, according to the *practiſe of the Apoſtles* when

hen difficulties emerge, meet together, and nſult what may be for the advancement of the *riſtian Religion*; and whoſo refuſeth to hear e Church when ſhe errs not from her rule, he o be accounted no better then a *Heathen and Publican.* And ſince the Church is called one dy, they ought to aſſociat together in mee-gs, ſeeing alſo they have their Power of HRIST, as Mediator, whereas the *Civil owers* hold of him as he is GOD, they have different tenor, diſtinct ends, and various les; therefore the authority of the Church is ong the things of GOD, which only be-ng to him. And indeed Chriſtians were very provided for by CHRIST, if they muſt matters of Religion be ſubject to the plea-e of ſecular and carnal men, who will be rea-to ſerve their own intereſts at the rate of the ne of every thing that is ſacred. It is true, e *Civil Powers* may and ought to convocat *Sy-ds* to conſult about matters of *Religion*, to re-ire *Church-men* to do their duty, to add their *nctions* to *Church Laws*, and to joyn with the nder part for carrying on a *Reformation.* But this is cumulative to the *Churches intrinſick wer, and not privative*; ſo that if the Magiſtrat l ſhort of his duty, the[illegible]e notwithſtāding of at, to go on as men empowered by JESUS HRIST, and *he who deſpiſeth them* (be his

quality what it will) *deſpiſeth him that ſent them.* *See pag.* 105. *to pag.* 109. *and pag.* 467. *to pag.* 486.

Baſil. In order to a clear progreſs in this matter, I ſhal firſt diſcuſs the *nature and power of the Church*, by which a ſtep ſhal be made to *the Power the Magiſtrat* may pretend to in matters ſacred. The Apoſtles being ſent by JESUS CHRIST, did every where promulgat the Goſpel, & required ſuch as received it, to meet often together for joint worſhip, & the free profeſſion of the Faith, wherein they were particularly obliged to the uſe of the Sacraments. The Apoſtles, and after them, all Church-men, were alſo endued with a double power: The one was declarative for promulgating the Goſpel: the other was directive, which properly is no power; and by this they were to adviſe in ſuch matters wherein they had no warrant to command: So *S. Paul* wrote ſometimes his own ſenſe, which he did *by permiſſion*, and not *by commandment*, only he adviſed, *as one that had obtained mercy to be faithful.* But becauſe CHRIST was to be *in his Church to the end of the world*, the things they had heard were to be committed to *faithful men, that they might be able to teach others.* All Church-men being thus the ſucceſſors of the Apoſtles, they are veſted with a *Divine Authority*, for ſolemn publiſhing the Goſpel; but with this odds from the Apoſtles, *That whereas they*

were

ere infallible, their ſucceſſors are ſubject to error.
nd the power of Church-men conſiſts formally
this, that they are *Heralds of the Goſpel*; and by
eir preaching it, a ſolemn offer of it is made to
l their hearers, which to deſpiſe, is to *deſpiſe*
m that ſent them. But in this power they are
ound up to the Commiſſion they have from
OD, ſo that what they ſay beyond that, is
ne of the divine Meſſage. Yet becauſe many
rticulars may fall in, about which it was im-
ſſible rules could be given, they have a dire-
ive authority, which if it be managed as *S. Paul*
d, we need fear no tyrannical impoſition from
And therefore in theſe matters their defini-
ns are not binding Laws, but rules of advice:
r in matters wherein we are left at liberty by
OD, if Church-men pretend to a Dominion
er our ſouls, they make us the ſervants of
en. And indeed it is the moſt incoherent
ing imaginable, for theſe who lay no claim to
fallibility, to pretend to abſolut obedience.
is true, the Laws of peace and order bind us
an aſſociation, if we be Chriſtians: and there-
re we ought to yeeld in many things for
ace: but ſince we are all a *Royal Prieſthood*,
y Church-men ſhould pretend to authori-
or juriſdiction, except in that which is ex-
eſly in their Commiſſion, wherein they are
rely Heralds, I do not ſee. It is true, Chri-

ſtians ought to aſſemble for worſhip, but for the aſſociations of Churches in Judicatories, I cannot imagine in what corner of the *New Teſtament* that ſhal be found: In which I am the more confirmed, ſince all the labor of that Pamphleter from *pag.* 126. *to* 144. could not find it out. For it is a ſtrange method to prove a divine warrant, becauſe ſome reaſons are brought to prove it muſt be ſo: to have cited the words, were a ſhorter and clearer method of proof; ſince to prove that ſuch a thing muſt be, and yet not to ſhow that it is, is only to attempt against the Scripture, for being defective in that which it ought to have contained. But if the phraſe of *one body* conclude a proof for Aſſociations, then ſince the body includes all Chriſtians, the whole faithful muſt meet together in Councils. For where have you a difference in that betwixt the Clergy, and the faithful Laicks? But here yeelding your Laick Elders of divine inſtitution, and to have from GOD an authority of ruling, as well as the Miniſters have, then why do they not all come to Presbyteries? And why but one deputed from them? Was not this an encroachment on them? For if they have from CHRIST a power to rule, as well as Miniſters, why ſhould not all the Elders meet in Presbyteries and Synods, as well as Miniſters? And why

one Elder from every Presbytery, when
ee Miniſters go to the National Synod? For
folly to ſay, becauſe Miniſters have a power
eaching, therefore in Presbyteries and Sy-
ds the Elders muſt only equal their number, &
National Synods be near half their number:
that will only ſay that in matters of doctrine
Elders ſhould be quite ſilent, but in matters
diſcipline, why all ſhould not come if any
ve a right from CHRIST, will not be proved.
d is not this to *Lord it over your brethren?* And
not your Miniſters thus tyranniſe over their
lers? But the reaſon of it was viſible, leſt the
lders had thereby got the power in their
nds, had they been the plurality in the Judica-
ies: which was well enough foreſeen & guar-
d againſt by your Clergy, who tho they were
lling to ſerve themſelves of them for a while,
had no mind to part with their beloved au-
rity. But for Synods, if the obligation to
em be from the unity of the Body, then no-
ng under an OEcumenical one will anſwer
s, which yet is ſimply unpracticable. Now as
your National Synods, it is viſible they are &
ſt be framed, according to the diviſions of
world in the ſeveral Kingdoms: for accor-
g to the rules are pretended from Scripture
the Church, the binding and looſing of ſins, or the
e) it follows that Parochial Congregations,
and

and the Paſtors in them, are veſted with an authoritative power: now why they ſhould be made to reſign this to the plurality of the Church-men of that Kingdom, will be a great atchievement to prove in your principles. For why ſhall not a Parochial Church make laws within it ſelf? And why muſt it renounce its priviledge to ſuch a number of Church-men caſt in ſuch a Claſſis by a humane power? As likewiſe, where find you a divine warrant for your delegating Commiſſioners to Synods? For either they are Plenipotentiaries, or ſuch as go upon a reſtricted deputation, but ſo as their votes beyond their Commiſſion ſhal ſignify nothing, till they return and be approved by thoſe who ſent them: if they go with a full power, aſſign a warrant for ſuch a delegation, or that many Church-men may commiſſionat one in their name, and that what ſhal be agreed to by the major part of theſe delegats, ſhal be a binding obligation on Chriſtians: and yet I know you will think the Independents carry the cauſe, if it be ſaid that the appointments of theſe ſuperior Courts have no authority till ratified by the inferior, which will reſolve the power into the inferior Courts. By all which I think it is clear abundantly, that the aſſociations of Churches into Synods, cannot be by a divine warrant. But I muſt call in ſome relief, for I grow weary of ſpeaking too long.

End

Eud. I ſuppoſe none will deny the aſſocia- of Churches to be an excellent mean for ſerving unity and peace: but to aſſert a di- e original for them, me thinks, is a hard task; truly to aſſert the divine authority of the or part which muſt be done according to the ciples of Presbytery, is a thing fuller of Ty- y over conſciences, then any thing can be ed from Epiſcopacy; ſince the greater part nankind being evil, which holds true of no of people more, then of Church-men, t miſchief may be expected if the plurality t decide all matters? And to ſpeak plainly, I k on a potion of Phyſick as the beſt cure for , who can think a National Synod, accor- g to the model of *Glaſgow*, is the Kingdom of RIST on earth, or that Court to which he h committed his authority, for he ſeems be- d the power or conviction of reaſon.

Crit. The Scripture clearly holds forth an au- rity among Church-men, but viſibly reſtri- d to their commiſſion, which truly is not perly a power reſiding among them, for y only declare what the rule of the Goſpel wherein if they keep cloſe to it, they are y Publiſhers of the Laws of CHRIST: and hey err from it, they are not to be regarded. s true the adminiſtration of Sacraments is propriated to them, yet he that will argue this

this to have proceeded more from the genera rules of order, the conſtant practiſe of the Church, and the fitneſs of the thing, which is truly ſutable to the dictats of nature, and the Laws of Nations; then from an expreſs poſitive command, needs much Logick to make good his attempt. It is true, the ordaining of ſucceſſors in their office belongs undoubtedly to them, and in trying them, rules are expreſly given out in Scripture, to which they ought to adhere and follow them: but as for other things, they are either deciſions of opinions, or rules for practiſe. In the former their authority is purely to declare, and in that they act but as men, and we find whole ſchools of them have been abuſed: and in the other, they only give advices and directions, but have no Juriſdiction: It is true, much noiſe is made about the Council of *Jeruſalem*, *pag.* 106. as if that were a warrant for Synods to meet together. But firſt, it is clear no command is there given, ſo at moſt that will prove Synods to be lawful, but that gives them no authority, except you produce a clear command for them, and obedience to them. Next, what ſtrange wreſting of Scripture is it, from that place to prove the ſubordination of Church Judicatories? for if that Council was not an OEcumenical Council, nor a Provincial one, which muſt be yeelded, ſince

we

ſee nothing like a Convocation; then either
ul & Barnabas were ſent from *Antioch*, as from
e ſiſter Church to ask advice of another; & if
it proves nothing for the authority of Synods,
ce advices are not Laws: or *Antioch* ſent to *Je-*
ſalem, as to a Superior Church by its conſtitu-
n, which cannot be imagined: for what autho-
y could the Church of *Jeruſalem* pretend over
ntioch? And indeed had that been true, ſome
ſtige of it had remained in Hiſtory; which is ſo
to the contrary, that the Church of *Jeruſalem*
s ſubordinat to the Church of *Ceſarea*, which
s Metropolitan in *Paleſtine*, was ſubject to *An-*
ch, the third Patriarchal See. It will therefore
main that this was only a reference to the other
oſtles, who beſides their extraordinary en-
wments and inſpiration, were acknowledged
all to be men of great eminency and authori-
: and therefore the authority of *Paul* and
arnabas not being at that time ſo univerſally
knowledged, they were ſent to *Jeruſalem*,
here *S. James* was reſident, and *S. Peter* occa-
nally preſent. Now the authority of the
ecree muſt be drawn from their infallible ſpi-
; otherwiſe it will prove too much, that one
hurch may give out decrees to another. But
ill the Apoſtles mutual conſulting or confer-
ng together, prove the National conſtitution,
nd authority of Synods or Aſſemblies?

Poly.

Poly. All that hath been ſaid illuſtrats clearly the practiſe of the *Jews*, among whom as the High Prieſt was poſſeſſed with a prophetical Spirit, which ſometimes fell on him by lapſes, as appears from what is ſaid of *Cajaphas*, and ſometimes from the ſhining of the Stones in the Pectoral, called the *Urim* and *Thummim*; ſo the *Prieſts and Levits* being the chief Truſtees and Depoſitaries of the Law, *Their lips were to preſerve knowledge, and the Law was to be ſought at their mouth*, yet they had no Legiſlative authority: they had indeed a Court among themſelves, called the *Parhedrim*, made up of the heads of the Orders, and of the Families; but that Court did not pretend to Juriſdiction, but only to explain things that concerned the Temple-worſhip: nay, the High Prieſt was ſo reſtricted to the *King and Sanhedrim*, that he might not conſult the Oracle without he had been ordered to do it by them: neither do we ever hear of any Laws given out, all the *Old Teſtament* over, in the name of the Prieſts. And in the *New Teſtament*, the Power (it ſeems) was to be managed by the body of the faithful, as well as by Church-men. It is true, the Apoſtles were clothed with an extraordinary power of *binding and looſing of ſins*; but no proofs are brought to juſtifie the pretences to Juriſdiction that are found among their ſucceſſors. For in the *Epiſtle*

to

Corinth, the rules there laid down, are ad-
eſſed to *all the Saints that were called to be faith-*
l: ſo alſo is the *Epiſtle* to the *Theſſalonians*, where
tells them to *note ſuch as walked diſorderly, and*
ve no fellowſhip with them; which are ſhrewd
ounds to believe that at firſt all things were
anaged Parochially, where the faithful were
ſo admitted to determine about what occur-
d: but for Synods, we find not the leaſt ve-
ge of them before the end of the ſecond Cen-
ry, that Synods were gathered about the con-
overſie concerning the day of *Eaſter*; and the
llowing Aſſociations of Churches, ſhow clear-
, that they took their model from the diviſion
the *Roman Empire*, and ſo according as the
ovinces were divided, the Churches in them
d aſſociat to the Metropolitans, and become
bordinat to them, and theſe were ſubordinat
the Patriarchs; by which means it was that
e Biſhops of *Rome* had the precedency, not
om any imaginary derivation from *S. Peter*:
r had they gone on ſuch rules, *Jeruſalem* where
ur LORD himſelf was, had undoubtedly
rried it of all the World: but *Rome* being the
perial City, it was the See of the greateſt au-
ority. And no ſooner did *Byzantium* creep
to the dignity of being the *Imperial City*, but
e Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* was made ſecond Pa-
iarch, and in all things equal to the Biſhop of
Rome,

Rome, the precedency only excepted. Much might be here ſaid for proving that theſe Synods did not pretend to a divine Original, though afterwards they claimed a high authority, yet their appointments were never called Laws, but only Canons and rules, which could not pretend to a Juriſdiction.

Baſil. But that I may not ſeem to rob the Church of all her power, I acknowledge that by the Laws of Nature it follows, that theſe who unite in the ſervice of GOD, muſt be warranted to aſſociat in meetings to agree on general rules, and to uſe means for preſerving purity and order among themſelves, and that all inferiors ought to ſubject themſelves to their rules. But as for that brave diſtinction of the Churches authority, being derived from CHRIST as Mediator, whereas the Regal Authority is from him as GOD, well doth it become its inventors, and much good may it do them. For me, I think, that CHRISTS aſſerting that *all power in heaven and in earth was given to him*; and his being called, *The KING of Kings, and LORD of Lords*, make it as clear as the Sun, that the whole OEconomy of this World is committed to him as Mediator: and as they who died before him, were ſaved by him, who was *ſlain from the foundation of the world*; ſo all humane authority was given by vertue of

the

the second Covenant, by which mankind was preserved from infallible ruine, which otherwise it had incurred by *Adams* fall. But leaving any further enquiry after such a foolish nicety, I go now to examine what the *Magistrats Power* is in matters of Religion: And first, I lay down for a maxime, *That the externals of Worship, or Government, are not of such importance, as are the rules of Justice and Peace, wherein formally the Image of* GOD *consists.* For CHRIST came to bring us to GOD: and the great end of his Gospel, is, the assimilation of us to GOD, of which, justice, righteousness, mercy and peace make a great part. Now what sacredness shal be in the outwards of Worship and Government, that these must not be medled with by his hands; and what unhallowedness is in the other, that they may fall within his Jurisdiction, my weakness cannot reach. As for instance, when the Magistrat allows *ten per cent* of interest, it is just to exact it; and when he brings it down to *six per cent*, it is oppression to demand *ten per cent*; so that he can determine some matters to be just or unjust by his Laws: now why he shal not have such a power about outward matters of Worship, or of the Government of the Church, judge you; since the one both in it self, and as it tends to commend us to GOD, is much more important then the other. It is

true, he cannot meddle with the holy things himſelf; for the Scripture-rule is expreſs, that men be *ſeparated for the work of the Miniſtery*: And without that ſeparation, he invades the Altar of GOD, that *taketh that honor upon him, without he be called to it.* But as for giving Laws in the externals of *Religion*, I ſee not why he may not do it, as well as in matters *Civil*. It is true, if he contradict the *Divine Law* by his commands, *GOD is to be obeyed rather then man.* But this holds in *things civil*, as well as *ſacred.* For if he command murder, or theft, he is undoubtedly to be diſobeyed, as well as when he commands amiſs in matters of *Religion.* In a word, all ſubjects are bound to obey him in every lawful command. Except therefore you prove that Church-men conſtituted in a Synod are not ſubjects, they are bound to obedience, as well as others: Neither doth this authority of the Magiſtrat any way prejudge the power CHRIST hath committed to his Church: For a father hath power over his children, and that by a *divine precept*, though the Supream Authority have power over him, and them both: ſo the Churches authority is no way inconſiſtent with the Kings Supremacy. As for their *Declarative Power*, it is not at all ſubject to him, only the exerciſe of it, to this or that perſon, may be ſuſpended: For ſince the Magiſtrat can baniſh

baniſh his ſubjects, he may well ſilence them: Yet I acknowledge if he do this, out of a deſign to drive the Goſpel out of his Dominions, they ought to continue in their duty, notwithſtanding of ſuch prohibition; *for GOD muſt be obeyed rather then man.* And this was the caſe of the *Primitive Biſhops*, who rather then give over the feeding their flocks, laid themſelves open to Martyrdom. But this will not hold for warranting turbulent perſons, who notwithſtanding of the Magiſtrats continuing all encouragements for the publick Worſhip of GOD, chooſe rather then concur in it (though not one of an hundred of them hath the confidence to call that unlawful) to gather ſeparated Congregations, whereby the flocks are ſcattered.

Phil. Nay, ſince you are on that ſubject, let me freely lay open the miſchief of it: It is a direct breach of the Laws of the Goſpel, that requires our ſoleman aſſembling together, which muſt ever bind all Chriſtians, till there be ſomewhat in the very conſtitutions of theſe Aſſemblies, that renders our meeting in them unlawful: which few pretend in our caſe. Next, the Magiſtrats commanding theſe publick Aſſemblies, is certainly a clear and ſuperadded obligation, which muſt bind all under ſin, till they can prove theſe our Meetings for worſhip unlawful. And as theſe ſeparated Conventicles

are of their own nature evil, ſo their effects are yet worſe, and ſuch as indeed all the ignorance and profanity in the Land is to be charged on them: for as they diſſolve the union of the Church, which muſt needs draw miſchief after it, ſo the vulgar are taught to deſpiſe their Miniſters, and the publick Worſhip, and thus get looſe from the yoak. And their dependance on theſe ſeparated Meetings, being but precarious, as they break away from the order of the Church, ſo they are not tyed to their own order: and thus betwixt hands, the vulgar loſe all ſenſe of Piety, and of the Worſhip of GOD. Next, in theſe ſeparated Meetings, nothing is to be had but a long preachment, ſo that the knowledge and manners of the people not being lookt after, and they taught to revolt from the ſetled *Diſcipline*, and to diſdain to be catechiſed by their Paſtors, *ignorance and profanity* muſt be the ſure effect of theſe divided Meetings. And in fine, the diſuſe of the *LORDS Supper* is a guilt of a high nature; for the vulgar are taught to loath the Sacrament from their Miniſters hands, as much as the Maſs: and preaching is all they get in their Meetings: ſo that what in all ages of the Church hath been looked on, as the great cheriſhing of Devotion and true Piety, and the chief preſerver of Peace among Chriſtians, is wearing out of practiſe with our

new

new modelled Chriſtians. Theſe are the viſible effects of ſeparating practiſes: but I ſhal not play the uncharitable diviner, to gueſs at the ſecret miſchief ſuch courſes may be guilty of.

Baſil. Truly, what you have laid out is ſo well known to us all, that I am confident *Iſotimus* himſelf muſt with much ſorrow acknowledge what wicked artes theſe are that ſome uſe to diſlocat the body of CHRIST, and to ſacrifice the intereſts of *Religion* to their vanity, humor, or perhaps their ſecular intereſts. But I hold on my deſign, and add, that if the Magiſtrat encroach on GODS prerogative, by *contradicting or abrogating divine Laws*, all he doth that way, falls on himſelf. But as for the Churches *Directive Power*, ſince the exerciſe of that is not of obligation, he may command a ſurceaſe in it. It is true, he may ſin in ſo doing; yet caſes may be wherein he will do right to diſcharge all Aſſociations of Judicatories, if a Church be in ſuch commotion, that theſe Synods would but add to the flame: but certainly he forbidding ſuch Synods, they are not to be gone about, there being no poſitive command for them in Scripture, and therefore a diſcharge of them contradicts no Law of GOD, and ſo cannot be diſobeyed without ſin: and when the Magiſtrat allows of Synods, he is to judge on whither ſide

in caſe of differences, he will paſs his Law: neither is the deciſion of theſe Synods obligatory in prejudice of his authority; for there can be but one Supream; and two Coordinat Powers are a *Chymæra*. Therefore in caſe a Synod and the Magiſtrat contradict one another in matters undetermined by GOD, it is certain a Synod ſins if it offer to countermand the *Civil Authority*, ſince all muſt be ſubject to the Powers that are, of which number the Synod is a part; therefore they are ſubject as well as others. And if they be bound to obey the Magiſtrats commands, they cannot have a power to warrant the ſubjects in their diſobedience, ſince they cannot ſecure themſelves from ſin by ſuch diſobedience. And in the caſe of ſuch countermands, it is indiſputable the ſubjects are to be determined by the Magiſtrats Laws, by which only the rules of Synods are Laws, or bind the conſciences formally; ſince without they be authorized by him, they cannot be Laws; for we cannot ſerve two Maſters, nor be ſubject to two Legiſlators. And thus, me thinks, enough is ſaid for clearing the Title of the *Magiſtrat in exacting our obedience to his Laws in matters of Religion.*

Crit. Indeed, the congeſting of all the *Old Teſtament* offers, for proving the Civil Powers their authority in things ſacred, were a task of time:

time: And firſt of all, that the High Prieſt might not conſult the Oracle, but when either deſired by the King, or in a buſineſs that concerned the whole Congregation, is a great ſtep to prove what the Civil Authority was in thoſe matters. Next, we find the Kings of *Judah* give out many Laws about matters of Religion: I ſhal wave the inſtances of *David* and *Solomon*, which are ſo expreſs, that no evaſion can ſerve the turn, but to ſay they acted by immediat Commiſſion, and were inſpired of GOD. It is indeed true, that they had a particular direction from GOD. But it is as clear, that they enacted theſe Laws upon their own authority, as Kings, and not on a Prophetical Power.

But we find *Jehoſhaphat*, 2 *Chr.* 17. *v.* 7. ſending to his Princes to teach in the Cities of *Judah*, with whom alſo he ſent *Prieſts* and *Levites*, and they went about and taught the people. There you ſee ſecular men appointed by the King to teach the people: he alſo, 2. *Chr.* 19. *v.* 5. ſet up in *Jeruſalem* a Court made up of *Levites, Prieſts, and the chief of the Fathers of Iſrael, for the judgement of the* LORD, *and for the controverſies among the people*; and names two Preſidents, *Amariah the chief Prieſt to be over them in the matters of the* LORD, *and Zebadiah for all the Kings matters.* And he that

will conſider theſe words, either as they ly in themſelves, or as they relate to the firſt inſtitution of that Court of ſeventy by *Moſes*, where no mention is made but of one Judicatory, or to the Commentary of the whole writtings, and Hiſtories of the *Jews*, ſhal be ſet beyond diſpute, that here was but one Court to judge both of ſacred and ſecular matters. It is true, the *Prieſts* had a Court already mentioned, but it was no Judicatory, and medled only with the rituals of the Temple. The *Levites* had alſo, as the other Tribes, a Court of twenty-three for their Tribe, which have occaſioned the miſtakes of ſome places among the *Jewiſh* writings: but this is ſo clear from their writings, that a very overly knowledge of them will ſatisfie an impartial obſerver. And it is yet more certain, that from the time of *Ezra*, to the deſtruction of the Temple, there was but one Court, that determined of all matters both ſacred and civil; who particularly tryed the Prieſts, if free of the blemiſhes which might caſt one from the ſervice, and could cognoſce on the High Prieſt, and whip him when he failed in his duty. Now this commixtion of theſe matters in one Judicatory, if it had been ſo criminal, whence is it that our LORD not only never reproved ſo great a diſorder, but when conveened before them, did not accuſe

cuſe their conſtitution, and anſwered to the High Prieſt when adjured by him? Likewiſe, when his Apoſtles were arraigned before them, they never declined that Judicatory, but pleaded their own innocence, without accuſing the conſtitution of the Court, though challenged upon a matter of doctrine. But they, *good men*, thought only of catching ſouls into the net of the Goſpel, and were utterly unacquainted with theſe new coyned diſtinctions. Neither did they refuſe obedience, pretending the Court had no Juriſdiction in theſe matters, but becauſe it was better to obey GOD then man; which ſaith, they judged obedience to that Court due, if it had not countermanded GOD.

But to return to *Jehoſhaphat*, we find him conſtituting theſe Courts, and chooſing the perſons and empowering them for their work, *for he conſtituted them for Judgement and for Controverſie*; ſo that though it were yeelded, as it will never be proved, that two Courts were here inſtituted, yet it cannot be denyed, but here is a Church Judicatory conſtituted by a King, the perſons named by him, a Preſident appointed over them, and a truſt committed to them. And very little Logick will ſerve to draw from this, as much as the Acts among us, aſſerting the Kings Supremacy yeeld to him.

Next,

Next, we have a clear instance of *Hezekiah*, who 2 *Chr.* 30. 2. *v.* with the *counsel of his Princes, and of the whole Congregation*, made a *decree for keeping the Passover*, that year *on the second moneth*, whereas the Law of GOD had affixed it to the *first moneth*, leaving only an exception, *Numb.* 9. 10. *for the unclean*, or such *as were on a journey*, to keep it on the second moneth. Upon which *Hezekiah* with the *Sanhedrim* and people, appoints the Passover to be entirely cast over to the second moneth for that year. Where a very great point of their worship (for the distinction of dayes was no smal matter to the *Jewes*) was determined by the King, without asking the advice of the Priests upon it. But that you may not think this was peculiar to the King of *Israel*, I shal urge you with other instances: When *Ezra* came from *Artaxerxes*, he brings a Commission from him, *Ezra ch. 7. v.* 25. 26. impowering him *according to the wisdom of his GOD, that was in his hand, to set up Magistrats and Judges, who might judge them that knew the Laws of his GOD, and teach them that knew them not:* and a severe certificat is passed upon the disobedient; and one of the branches of their punishment, which is by the Translators rendered *banishment*, being in the *Chaldaick*, *rooting out*, is by some judged to be *excommunication*; which is the more probable, be-

ecauſe afterwards, *chap.* 10. *v.* 8. the cenſure he threatens on theſe who came not upon is Proclamation, is, *forfeiture of goods, and ſearation from the Congregation.* Here then it ſeems Heathen King gives authority to excommuniat: but be in that what will, *Ezra* upon his reurn acted in a *high Character*, he makes the *Prieſts, Levites*, and all *Iſrael*, to ſwear to put way their ſtrange wives: he conveens all the people under the certificat of ſeparation from he Congregation, and enjoyns confeſſion of heir ſins and amendment: and we find both him and *Nehemiah* acting in a *high Character* about the ordering of divine matters, which could only flow from the Kings Commiſſion, for neither of them were Prophets, nor was *Ezra* the High Prieſt but his brother, and ſo no more then an ordinary Prieſt. *Mordecai* likewiſe inſtituted the feaſt of *Purim*, for which nothing could warrant him, but the Kings authority, committed to him, who gave him his ring for ſealing ſuch orders, ſince he was neither King, Prieſt nor Prophet. And on the way, let me obſerve what occurrs from that Hiſtory, for proving what was yeſterday pleaded for, *That Subjects ought not to reſiſt, no not the tyranny of their Superiors*, ſince a writing was procured from *Ahaſuerus* for warranting the *Jews* to avenge themſelves, and to ſtand for their lives,

and

and to deſtroy and ſlay all that would aſſault them, which ſaith they might not have done this before that writing was given out, and yet their killing of 74000. of their enemies ſhows, what their ſtrength was. But all I have ſaid will prove that the Civil Powers under the Old Teſtament did formally judge about matters of Religion; and that that priviledge belongs to Kings by vertue of their Regal dignity, and not as they are in Covenant with GOD, ſince even Heathen Kings give out orders about divine matters.

Poly. If from ſacred you deſcend to humane practiſes, nothing was more uſed then that the Emperors judged in matters of Religion, neither was this yeelded to them only after they became Chriſtians, but *Euſebius lib. 7. cap.* 30. tells, how they made application to *Aurelian* a Heathen Emperor, for turning out *Samoſatenius* out of the Church of *Antioch*, who decreed that the houſes of the Church ſhould be given to thoſe Biſhops, whom the Chriſtians of *Italy* and the *Roman* Biſhops ſhould recommend to them. *Conſtantine* alſo, when not baptized, did all his life formally judge in matters both of doctrine and diſcipline: and for the Laws they made about Church matters, they abound ſo much, that, as *Grotius* ſaith, *One needs not read them, but look on them to be ſatisfied about this.*

And

nd indeed I know not how to expreſs my won-
er at the affrontedneſs of that Pamphleter, who
enyes this, *pag.* 483. Pray ask him, was the de-
ermining about the age, the qualifications, the
lection, the duties of Church-men, the de-
laring for what things they ſhould be depoſed,
r excommunicated, a formal paſſing of Laws in
Church matters, or only the adding Sanctions
o the Church determinations? And yet who
ill but with his eye run through either the firſt
ix *Titles* of the *Code*, or the 123. *Novel*, be-
ides many other places, all theſe, and many
nore Laws about Church matters will meet
im. But ſhould I take a full carreer here, I am
ure I ſhould be tedious, and *Grotius* hath con-
eſted ſo many inſtances of this, that I refer
he curious Reader to him for full ſatisfaction.
The elections of Biſhops which had been for-
merly in the hands of the people and Clergy,
with the Provincial Synods that judged of them,
became ſo tumultuary, that popular elections
were diſcharged by the Council of *Laodicea*,
Can. 13. and the Emperors did either formally
name, as *Theodoſius* did *Nectarius*, or reſerve
the ratifying their election to themſelves. And
I muſt confeſs, it is a pretty piece of Hiſtory, to
ſay the Biſhops conſented to this, either as diffi-
dent of their office, or out of ambition. *See*
page 485. Tell your friends that they muſt either
learn

learn more knowledge, or pretend to leſs; for can they produce the leaſt veſtige for the one branch of this alternative, that the Biſhops their allowing the Emperor ſuch an intereſt in their elections, flowed from a diſtruſt of their office? Let them give but one ſcrape of proof for this, and let them triumph as much as they will. Is it not a pretty thing to ſee one talk ſo ſuperciliouſly of things he knows not?

Iſot. But all you have brought will never prove that a King may at one ſtroke ſubvert a Government eſtabliſhed in the Church, and turn out all who adhere to it, and ſet up another in its place; neither will this conclude that the King may enact all things about Eccleſiaſtical matters, and perſons, by his own bare authority, which is a ſurrender of our conſciences to him: certainly, this is to put him in CHRISTS ſtead, and what miſchievous effects may follow upon this, if all matters of Religion be determined, by the pleaſure of ſecular and carnal men, who conſider their intereſts and appetits more then GODS glory, or the good of the Church and of ſouls? Truly my heart trembles to think on the effects this both hath produced, and ſtill may bring forth. *See pag.* 483.

Phil. It is charity to eaſe your lungs ſometimes by taking a turn in the diſcourſe, though you need none of my help. But what you ſay,

Iſot.

ſotimus, doth no way overturn what hath been aſſerted: for either the change that was made was neceſſary, ſinful, or indifferent: the two former ſhal not be at this time debated, but ſhal be afterwards diſcuſſed: but if it be indifferent, then the Kings Laws do oblige us to obedience, and the miſchief hath followed on the change falls to their ſhare, who do not obey the Kings Laws, when the matter of them is lawful. And as for the thruſting out Church-men when they are guilty, *Solomons* precedent is convincing, who thruſt out *Abiathar* from the High Prieſthood; neither can the leaſt hint be given to prove that he acted as inſpired, and not as a King: and *Nehemiah* though but commiſſionated by *Artaxerxes*, thruſt one out from the Prieſthood, for marrying a ſtrange woman.

For your prying into Acts of Parliament, truly neither you nor I need be ſo much converſant in them. Neither were it any ſtrange matter, if ſome expreſſions in them would not bear a ſtrict examen. But that you now challenge about the *Kings enacting of all matters*, will never infer a ſurrender of conſcience to him; for certainly that muſt relate to what goeth before, of the *outward Government and Policy of the Church*. Beſides, none will quarrel the phraſe of the *Kings authority* in all things that are *Civil*; yet that will not infer that he can enact the lawfulneſs of

murder

murder and theft. So theſe expreſſions muſt carry with them *a tacite exception.* Yea, even without that allowance, the phraſe may be well juſtified, ſince it only imports that the Kings enacting any thing in theſe matters, makes them legal, which differs much from lawful; and ſaith only that ſuch Orders iſſued forth by the King, are *de facto* Laws, which will not conclud they muſt be obeyed; but only that his authority is to be acknowledged, either by obedience, if the command be juſt, or by ſuffering, if unjuſt. As for the effects this may produce, I am ſure they cannot prove worſe then theſe which have followed upon the pretences of the Churches *abſolut authority, and intrinſick Soveraign Power.* And indeed ſince there is ſo much corruption among men, nothing that falls into the hands of men, can ſcape the mixtures of abuſe at long run. But I muſt add, that the paſſions and pride of many Church-men in all ages have been ſuch, that the deciſion of the plurality of Church-men, ſeems the model of the world that is fulleſt of danger.

Iſot. Three things yet remain to be diſcuſſed: The one is, if obedience be due to the Laws, when they command things contrary to our conſciences? For ſure you cannot pretend in that caſe, to give a preference to humane Laws beyond conſcience, which is the voice of GOD.

GOD. The next is, when the Magiſtrat commands things juſt of themſelves, but upon unjuſt motives and narratives, whither my obedience doth not homologat his bad deſigns? And finally, where the commands of the Magiſtrat are manifeſtly unlawful, how far ſhould the Church, and Church-men, oppoſe and contradict them? For a bare non-obedience ſeems not to be all we are bound to, in that caſe. When I am ſatisfied in theſe things, I will quite this purpoſe.

Baſil. To engage in a particular diſcuſſion of what is now moved by you, would draw on more diſcourſe then our preſent leaſure will allow off; yet I ſhal attempt the ſaying of what may ſatisfie a clear and unprejudged mind. And to the firſt, I ſhal not fall on any longer enquiry into the nature and obligation of conſcience, then to tell that *conſcience is a conviction of our rational faculties, that ſuch or ſuch things are ſutable to the nature and will of* GOD. Now all Religion is bound upon us, on this account, that there is ſuch evidence offered for its truth, which may and ought to ſatisfie the ſtricteſt examen of reaſon. And all certainty is reſolved in this, that our rational faculties are convinced of the truth of the objects that ly before us: which conviction when applyed to divine matters, is called *Conſcience.* But there may be

great miſtakes in this conviction: for either the prejudices that ly on our minds from our ſenſes, the prepoſſeſſions of education, intereſt, or humors, the want of a due application of our faculties to their objects, or chiefly the dulneſs and leſion of our organes, the corruption of our minds through ſin and luſt, occaſion many errors: ſo that often without good reaſon oft contrary to it, we take up perſwaſions, to which we ſtifly adhere, and count ſuch convictions evidences of the will of GOD. I acknowledge, when a man lyes under a perſwaſion of the will of GOD, he ought not to go croſs to it: for this opens a door to Atheiſm, when that is contradicted of which we are convinced. But if this perſwaſion be falſe, it cannot ſecure a man from ſinning in following of it. For it is a mans own fault that he is thus impoſed upon, ſince if his rational faculties were duly applyed, and well purified, they ſhould prove unerring touchſtones of truth. If therefore through vanity, wilfulneſs, raſhneſs, or any other byas of the mind, it be carried to wrong meaſures, a man is to blame himſelf, and thus his error ought to aggravat, and not leſſen his guilt. If then a mans conſcience dictat to him the contrary of what GOD commands, in that caſe, he is in a viſible hazard: for his error can never take away GODS authority, and ſo his wrong infor-

informed conſcience doth not ſecure him from guilt, if he be diſobedient. On the other hand, nothing in Scripture can bind a man to act againſt the convictions of conſcience, ſince we are bound to believe the Scriptures, only becauſe of the evidence of their authority to our rational faculties: If then our belief of the Scriptures reſt on that foundation, no part of Scripture can bind us to walk contrary to that evidence, for then it ſhould deſtroy that principle on which our obligation to believe it ſelf is founded, which is the evidence of reaſon; and ſo in that caſe, a man ſins whatever he do. Neither is this to be accounted ſtrange, ſince that *erroneous conſcience* is from mans own fault. And that which ſome alledge to eſcape this, that in ſuch caſes a man ought to forbear from acting, will not ſerve turn, to excuſe a man from ſin: for in theſe Precepts which exact a poſitive obedience, ſuch a forbearance and ſurceaſing from action, is a ſin.

Upon theſe evidences then it will follow, that if the convictions of our conſcience run contrary to the Magiſtrats commands, theſe *convictions* are either well grounded, or ill: If the former, then the Magiſtrats command being contrary to the nature and will of GOD, are not to be obeyed: If ill grounded, then that miſtaken perſwaſion cannot ſecure us from ſin,

no more then *in the caſe of conſcience* contradicting the Law of GOD: for the Laws of the Magiſtrats in things lawful, are the Laws of GOD, being the application of his general Laws unto particular inſtances, by one clothed with authority from him. Therefore though I do not ſay the Laws of the Magiſtrat can warrant our counteracting an *erroneous conſcience*; yet on the contrary, a *miſinformed conſcience* will not ſecure us when we diſobey the Magiſtrats lawful commands. And thus I think your firſt queſtion is clearly anſwered.

Eud. You have a great deal of reaſon to ſay ſo, your diſcourſe being ſo cloſely rational, that I cannot ſee an eſcape from any part of it; yet I muſt add, that certainly it is a piece of *Chriſtian tenderneſs*, which obligeth all in Authority, to beware of laying gall-traps and ſnares in the way of *tender conſciences*. And the beſt way to get an *undiſputed obedience*, is, that their commands be lyable to as few exceptions as is poſſible: and that the good of any ſuch Laws be well ballanced with the hazards of them, that ſo the Communion of the Church in all outwards, particularly in the Sacraments, may be had on as eaſie termes as is poſſible, whereby nothing be enacted that may frighten away weaker minds from *the fellowſhip of the Saints*. But on the other hand, great caution muſt be had by all ſubjects

on

on what grounds they refuſe *obedience to the Laws*, that ſo they be not found following their own deſigns and intereſts, under a color of adhering firmly to *their conſciences*. They muſt deliver themſelves from all prepoſſeſſions, and narrowly examine all things, ere they adventure on refuſing *obedience to the Laws*. But now conſider if an unjuſt motive or narrative in a Law, deliver *tender conſciences* from an obligation to obey it, or not?

Baſil. If the Magiſtrat do couple his motive and narrative with our obedience, ſo that we cannot do the one without a ſeeming conſent to the other, then certainly we are not to obey: For actions being often ſigns of the thoughts, an action how indifferent ſoever, if declared a ſign of concurring in a ſinful deſign, makes us guilty, in ſo far as we expreſs our concurrence by a ſign enjoyned for that end. But if the motive or narrative be ſimply an account of the Magiſtrats own thoghts, without expreſſing that *obedience* is to be underſtood as a *concurrence* in ſuch intentions, then we are to obey a lawful command, though enacted upon a bad deſign: For we muſt obey theſe in Authority, ever till they ſtand in competition with GOD. If then their Laws contradict not GODS Precepts, neither in their natural nor intended ſignification, they are to be obeyed, whatever the

grounds were for enacting them, which is only the Magiſtrats deed, for which he ſhal anſwer to GOD.

Poly. This calls me to mind of two ſtories not impertinent to this purpoſe: The one is of *Julian the Apoſtat*, who to entangle the Chriſtians, that never ſcrupled the bowing to the Emperors Statue, as a thing lawful, cauſed ſet up his with the Images of ſome of the Gods about it, that ſuch as bowed to it, might be underſtood, as (likewiſe) bowing to the Images: which abuſed ſome of the ſimpler: but the more diſcerning refuſed to bow at all to thoſe Statues, becauſe he intended to expound that innocent bowing to his Statue, as an adoration of the Gods about it. A Chriſtian likewiſe being brought to the King of *Perſia*, did according to the Law bow before him; but when he underſtood that to be exacted as a divine honor to the King, he refuſed it.

Eud. This is clear enough that all actions are as they are underſtood, and accordingly to be performed, or ſurceaſed from. But it ſeems more difficult to determine what is to be done in caſe a Magiſtrat enact wicked Laws? Are nor both his Subjects bound to refuſe obedience; and the heads of the Church, and the watchmen of ſouls likewiſe to witneſs againſt it? And may they not declare openly their diſlike of

ſuch

ſuch laws or practiſes, & proceed againſt him with the cenſures of the Church? ſince as to the cenſures of the Church, we ſee no reaſon why they ſhould be diſpenſed with *reſpect of perſons*, which *S. James* condemns in all Church Judicatories.

Baſil. I ſhal not need to repeat what hath been ſo often ſaid, that *we muſt obey GOD rather then man*: if then the Magiſtrats enjoyn what is directly contrary to the *divine Law*, all are to refuſe obedience, and watch-men ought to warn their flocks againſt ſuch hazards; and ſuch as can have admittance to their Princes, or who have the charge of their conſciences, ought with a great deal of ſincere freedom, as well as humble duty, repreſent the evil and ſinfulneſs of ſuch Laws: but for any *Synodical Convention*, or any Declaration againſt them, no warrant for that doth appear; and therefore if the Magiſtrat ſhal ſimply diſcharge all Synods, I cannot ſee how they can meet without ſin. But for Parochial meetings of Chriſtians for a ſolemn acknowledgment of GOD, ſuch Aſſemblings for divine Worſhip, being enjoyned both by the Laws of Nature, and Nations, and particularly commanded in the Goſpel, no conſideration can free Chriſtians from their obligation, thus to aſſemble for Worſhip: if then the Magiſtrat ſhould diſcharge theſe or any part of them, ſuch as Prayer, Praiſes, and reading of

Scriptures, preaching the Goſpel, or the uſe of the Sacraments, they are notwithſtanding of all that to be continued in. But for the conſultative or directive Government of the Church, till a divine Command be produced for Synods or Diſcipline, it cannot lawfully be gone about without or againſt his authority.

Crit. For refuſing obedience to an unjuſt command, of ſurceaſing viſible Worſhip, the inſtance of *Daniel* is ſignal: who not only continued his adorations to GOD, for all *Darius* his Law; but did it openly, and avowedly, that ſo he might own his ſubjection to GOD. But for reproving Kings, we ſee what caution was to be obſerved in it; ſince GOD ſent Prophets with expreſs Commiſſions for it in the Old Teſtament: and *Samuel* notwithſtanding of this ſevere meſſage to *Saul*, *yet honored him before his people*. It is true, there ſhould be no reſpect of perſons in Chriſtian Judicatories: but that is only to be underſtood of theſe who are ſubject to them: and how it can agree to the King who is Supream, to be a ſubject, is not eaſily to be comprehended. Since then honor and obedience is by divine precept due to Magiſtrats, nothing that invades that honor, or detracts from that obedience, can be lawfully attempted againſt them: ſuch as is any Church-cenſure or excommunication. And therefore I

can-

cannot ſee how that practiſe of *Ambroſe* upon *Theodoſius*, or other later inſtances of ſome Biſhops of *Rome*, can be reconciled to that, *Render fear to whom fear, and honor to whom honor is due.*

Phil. I am ſure their practiſe is far leſs juſtifiable, who are alwayes preachiug about the Laws and times to the people, with virulent reflections on King, Parliament and Council: much more ſuch as not content with flying diſcourſes, do by their writings, which they hope ſhal be longer lived, ſtudy the vilifying the perſons, and affronting the authority of theſe GOD hath ſet over them. And how much of this ſtuff the Preſs hath vented theſe thirty years by paſt, ſuch as knew the late times, or ſee their writings, can beſt judge.

Eud. Now our diſcourſe having dwelt ſo long upon generals, is to deſcend to particulars: That we may examine whither upon the grounds hitherto laid down, the late tumults, or the preſent Schiſms and diviſions can be juſtified, or ought to be cenſured? I know this is a nice point, and it is to be tenderly handled, leſt all that ſhal be ſaid be imputed to the ſuggeſtions of paſſions and malice. Wherefore let me intreat you who are to bear the greater part of that diſcourſe, to proceed in it calmly, that it may appear your deſigns are not to lodge infamy on any party or perſon, but ſimply to lay

lay out things as they are: hoping withall, that you will not take your informations of what you ſay from the tatles of perſons concerned, but will proceed on true and ſure grounds. And that we may return to this with the greater compoſedneſs of ſpirit, let our ſerious thoughts be interrupted with ſome cheerfuller diverſions: for our ſpirits are now too far engaged to fall upon ſuch a head.

Iſot. You have a great deal of reaſon to guard your friends well when they are to fall upon ſuch matters, leſt they ſin againſt the generation of GODS children. For my part, I am not afraid to enter on a diſcuſſion of theſe things, and doubt not to make it appear how the LORDS work was ſignally carried on by his faithful ſervants, and that he himſelf appeared in it, even to the conviction of all beholders. If there were any either of the Church or State, who covered their own bad deſigns, under theſe pretences, that makes not the cauſe a whit the worſe: For CHRIST *choſe twelve, and one of them had a devil.*

Phil. Were I at preſent to fall a canvaſing theſe things, I doubt not I ſhould quickly make all your plumes fall off: but I am willing at this time to break off our Conference: for this point will neither be ſoon diſpatched nor eaſily managed; therefore we ſhal now part with an appoint-

pointment to meet next day in this ſame place after dinner.

Baſil. I believe none of us are ſo weary of another, or of the diſcourſes we have toſſed theſe two dayes, that it is needful to apprehend any will fail of being here at that hour: therefore, good night to you all.

Iſot. Be ſure, I ſhal keep if an unavoidable excuſe detain me not. Adieu.

Crit. For me and *Polyhiſtor*, though it is like we ſhal not have great occaſion of bearing our ſhare in your diſcourſe, yet we will not fail to be here.

Eud. I cannot expreſs my ſenſe of the honor you do me, in making this place ſtill happy with ſo many good company, and ſo much pleaſant diſcourſe: and therefore you may aſſure your ſelves, I will wait for your return, not without impatience. And ſo I bid you all, good night.

THE

THE THIRD CONFERENCE.

Iſotimus.

WE are again as good as our word in keeping this appointment, and I hope we ſhal be no leſs exact in obſerving the rule we concluded laſt night of tempering our paſſions; only I muſt guard you againſt the miſtaking any zeal I may expreſs for paſſion: remember who ſaid, *The zeal of thy houſe hath eaten me up, who alſo ſcourged the buyers and ſellers out of the Temple.*

Eud. I confeſs, I want not my fears of ſome heat and exceſs in this dayes diſcourſe: but I will crave leave to check it on what ſide ſoever it appear. I know there is a holy zeal for GOD, which will inflame a devout mind. But its fire is mild and gentle, free of bluſtering and diſorder: and that rage which is in many, for ſome parties or opinions, and againſt others, being

ng as void of knowledge as of charity, ought ot to pretend to Chriſts example, unleſs they e likewiſe acted by his Spirit. A diligent earch will quickly diſcover, if our motives and naxims have a tincture of his lowly meek and elf-denying ſpirit in them. And certainly if our zeal be for GOD, it will take its degrees rom the proportion of its objects. It is there-ore a *Phariſaical* pretence to own a zeal for ome ſmaller matters, which have ſcarce been hought upon by the whole ſeries of Chriſtians n all ages, till of late, when we are ſo cold in he defence of Peace, Charity, obedience to hoſe over us, and the Unity of the Church: which are great, certain, and indiſpenſible du-ies. That zeal likewiſe which tranſports a man nto unjuſtifiable heats of railing againſt parti-ular perſons, and appears in a bitter humor of dull jearing, and bold detraction, hath no rea-on to ſhroud it ſelf under the example of CHRISTS holy zeal; who though in the ſpirit of a zealot, having proved his divine miſſion aud authority by miracles, he whipped he defilers of the Temple out of it; yet that diſpenſation wherein ſuch practiſes were not nuſual from extraordinary perſons, being now changed into the new one, whoſe diſtinguiſhing haracter is Charity, we are to bridle all the motions of diſtempered heat, leſt the effects

of

of it be as unjuſtifiable as it ſelf is. For it is to be conſidered, that the proper characters of the Goſpel Spirit, are not devotion towards GOD, or zeal for his truths, which were common both with the Religion traditionally conveyed from *Adam*, and *Noah*, and that which was delivered to *Moſes*; but that which CHRIST hath made the cogniſance of his diſciples, is, *That they love one another*; whereby all muſt know them to be ſuch. And therefore all theſe who diſcover a ſpirit of hatred, rage, and malice at theſe, of whom they cannot deny but they may be CHRISTS diſciples, prove themſelves to be void of his Spirit. Now, *Iſotimus*, what endleſs complaints could I here make of ſome you know of, who are perpetually trafficking to make all who differ from them odious, who catch up every tatle they hear that may defame them, and are ſure to ſpread it as far as either their tongue or pen can reach: nor are they nigards of their additions to them, to make them ſwell bigger. With what marvellous joy do they ſuck in an ill report? and though it be but dubiouſly related, they will be ſure to vent it as the greateſt truth in the world. And when the ſtock of reports fail them, then they break in upon their magazins of forgeries: and here is an endleſs trade. Sometimes they will piece up things,

as

as incoherent as the rags of a Beggers cloke, and ſhow either their pretended *intelligence*, or profound *ſagacity*, to ſmel out bad *intentions*. If they can fix nothing on their *adverſary*, then that he is an *hypocrite*, or a *diſſembler*, comes well to ſerve all purpoſes, and to defeat the beſt *intentions*: And, oh! but the jealouſies of Popery, and Jeſuitical practiſes, work wonders on their belief! Indeed, *Sir*, I muſt tell you freely, I ſee a ſpirit ſtirring among us, which I look upon as tinctured with the deepeſt dye of *Antichriſtianiſm*, and ſo void of the common impreſſions of good nature and civility; but much more of his Image, who will have us *learn of him, in that he is meek and lowly*, that really a man had as well live among *Scithyans* and *Barbarians*, as among ſuch waſps and vipers. Every thing is alike for their malice. Do ſome that differ from them live in a franker way, theſe are ſure to be called *licencious and profane*. Are others more ſevere, ſilent, and retired, who expreſs a contempt of the world with all its enjoyments, theſe muſt paſs for Papiſts, Juglars and Hypocrits; and their beſt actions muſt be laſhed with the worſt cenſures. Again, if we treat them ſoftly with gentleneſs and reſpect, then they are inſolent, and impute ſuch uſage to our diſtruſt of our own opinions, and a forced value of their way. And if we uſe a little more free-

dom

dom to ſpeak home, and diſcover their weakneſs and perverſneſs to them, then they rage and ſome, and call us *blaſphemers*; and apply all the threatnings againſt mockers of GOD and piety, to ſuch as ſhal offer to unmask them, or diſcloſe any of their follies. If theſe in Authority coërce them, nothing is to be heard but complaints of *perſecution, and revilings, and evil ſurmiſings:* But will gentle courſes mollifie their hearts? No, not ſo much as to be grateful or civil to thoſe to whom they ow them: but they will be ſure to obſerve how GOD binds up the hands of the wicked, and how marvelouſly he protects his own: and all the favor ſhewed them will have no better character then a *very mean and ſcant act of Juſtice, elicite by a viſible State conveniency, if not neceſſity.* *See page* 493. You know of whom I mean, and how juſtly applicable theſe characters are to them: and that they are not the dreams of an *extravagant fancy*; but true, though imperfect deſcriptions of what every one ſees to be among us.

Iſot. I am heartily ſory to find you the firſt that ſwerves from your own rule, and to hear you engage in a diſcourſe ſo unlike your ſelf, at leaſt ſo different from the character is conceived of you: theſe invectives being fitter for the *Author of the friendly debate, the Scribler of the Dialogues, or the Aſſerter of Eccleſiaſtical Policy*, who have mor-

mortally wounded *Religion*, and all the profeſſions and expreſſions of it, under a pretence of unvailing the *Phariſaical ſpirit*. And indeed you are now in the ſame tract, your deſign being to charge all the faithful ſervants of CHRIST, with this tatling, whiſpering, and cenſorious temper; becauſe perhaps ſome idle people who own a kindneſs for theſe opinions, but really are of no principles, may be guilty of theſe ways.

Eud. I beſeech you, wreſt not my words beyond my deſign, and their meaning. I charge not the whole party with theſe arts: yet that there is too great complyance given to them, and too little freedom uſed againſt them, by too many, may without unjuſtice, or breach of charity, be averred: but the diſcloſing of theſe is ſo far from *injuring Religion*, that I know nothing ſo proper for recovering the world from the jealouſies theſe arts have occaſioned at it, as the unmasking of that ſpirit; that ſo the amiable and lovely viſage of *true Religion* may appear in its own luſtre, and free of theſe falſe colors ſome unjuſt pretenders to it, have caſt over it: and therefore theſe writings you mention, ſeem to have purſued a noble deſign, which ſhal not want its reward. But remember I make a vaſt difference betwixt the being of an opinion, and the purſuing all theſe crooked and wicked

practiſes for its defence, which I have laid before you. At the former, I have no quarrel: for knowing how ſubject my ſelf is to miſtakes, I cenſure and judge none for their opinions, till they ſtrike at the *foundations of faith*, or a *good life*: And ſo do not only not charge all your party with theſe imputations, but know a great many of them who are very free of them: but that many are too guilty of them, is what your ſelf dares not deny. And how much of that temper appears in the late Pamphlets, I leave with every rational *Reader* to conſider: for it is not worth the while for any of us to ſit down, & canvaſs them all. But how guilty are moſt of you in this which you here blame me unjuſtly for, which is the charging a party with the eſcapes, how great or ſignal ſoever, of ſome individuals. For to undertake the Patrociny of every man in every party, is that which none in his right wits will do: To deal therefore equally with you, I neither think your party nor ours, culpable for the faults of ſome particular perſons. But, *Sir*, when a perverſe detracting ſpirit gets in to theſe who pretend highly, certainly they ought to be told it, and that roundly too. For you know the greateſt danger to *Religion*, is to be apprehended from *the leaven of the Scribes and Phariſees*; ſince open and diſcernible faults do not ſo much prevail for infecting the *Chriſtian Societies*,

as

as theſe ſecret and more eaſily palliated errors. Conſider therefore a little what was the righteouſneſs of the *Phariſees*, and what was their leaven, and ſearch for it; leſt it *yet leaven you*, and *leſt your righteouſneß exceed not theirs*. The *Phariſees* prayed often, and long, both in the Synagogues, ſtreets, and widows houſes: they ſtudied the Law exactly, and had a great reverence for *Moſes* and the *Prophets*, and much zeal againſt *blaſphemers*, *falſe teachers and heretick*s: They were ſtrict obſervers of the *Sabbath*, and were careful to prepare for their *Paß-over ſolemnities*: They had great reſpect for the *opinions of their Anceſtors*: They looked *grave and ſolemn*: They *faſted often*, *and gave tythes of all they had*: Their outward deportment was not only clean, but beautiful: They were zealous to gain *Proſelyts*, and expreſſed a tenderneſs of *conſcience*, even in the ſmalleſt matters: They were careful to avoid all converſe with profane or wicked perſons. In a word, they had many things, which to a vulgar and leſs diſcerning eye, made a fair ſhow in the fleſh. But with all this, they were proud, and exalted in their own conceits, ſo that they deſpiſed all other perſons: They were Magiſterial, and deſired to preſcribe to every body: They were full of empty boaſtings, and aſſumed to themſelves big and ſwelling titles: and all their opinions they obtruded

as Oracles. *They did all to be ſeen of men, and loved ſalutations in the market places, and the uppermoſt rooms at feaſts.* They envyed any they ſaw outſtrip them in true worth; and hated and contemned all that followed theſe. They ſtudied to calumniat and revile every perſon that oppoſed them, with the moſt unjuſt and cruel reproaches, excommnicating all who adhered to them: Neither would they yeeld to the cleareſt evidences were offered for their conviction: and nothing but the blood of the moſt innocent could ſatisfie their revenge. They were covetous, and *devoured widows houſes*, with their pretences of devotion. They were falſe and ſubdolous, ſtudying to enſnare others in their ſpeeches, or wreſt what they ſaid to a contrary and miſchievous ſenſe. They were traytors to theſe in Authority, though when it might ſerve their ends, they ſpared not to pretend much zeal for them: and the fervor of their zeal made them often attempt the murdering of thoſe who oppoſed them, and diſcovered their falſe pretexts, and miſchievous deſigns. And from this, let all judge how much of that *Phariſaical leaven* doth yet lurk, and leaven among us. I know the application would be thought as invidious, as it is obvious. And, I pray GOD, thoſe guilty of theſe evils, may charge them home upon themſelves: For I confeſs, I love not that

part of the *Chirurgians trade* ſo well, as to dwel longer on the cutting of ulcers, or the ſearching of ſores: and theſe whom this general hint will not help to ſome conviction, would be little prevailed upon by a cloſer diſcovery of the paralell. But miſtake me not, as if I charged one party only with this leaven, which is, alace! too viſible among many of all ſides and parties. But to dwel no longer on generals, which every one will drive off himſelf, and lodge on others, let us now come to a cloſer review of our late times. And here, *Philarcheus*, I quite the Theam to you, who I know can manage it better.

Phil. Truly, when I reflect on the late times, and the ſpirit which did then act in the Judicatories both of Church and State, I wonder much how any can be guilty of the error of thinking it was the cauſe of GOD was then fought for. I deny not but a great many, yea, I am willing to hope the greater part, were miſled and abuſed, and did imagine it was *Religion and Liberties* they fought for; and ſo went out as they were called, in the ſimplicity of their heart, and knew not any thing of the ſecret deſigns of their Leaders: As in the caſe of *Abſoloms* rebellion, two hundred went from *Jeruſalem* with him, which might well a little excuſe their fault, but could not alleviat the guilt of that unnatural rebellion: ſo whatever may be ſaid for excuſing the

multitudes, who, I doubt not, meant well, yet that will never ſerve for vindicating the courſe was followed. I confeſs, if I ſaw any remorſe or ſhame for bypaſt miſcarriages; if I found theſe people we ſpeak of, either humbled for them before GOD, or aſhamed of them among men, I ſhould be the laſt on earth who would upbraid them with them: and that the rather, that *His Majeſty* hath buried the remembrance of them by a gracious oblivion. But when they continue ſo inſolent, as ſtill to bear up ſo high in their pretentions, as if GOD had been viſibly with them: and when they think it an injury to their innocency to tell them of an indemnity, who would not be tempted to take them to task, and examine all their vain boaſtings, and empty pretences? to which I am both provoked from their arrogance, and invited from the evident proofs of all I ſhal alledge, which I can lay before you from authentical Papers and Regiſters: and I ſhal freely tell you, that if any of theſe Pamphleters had but the half to ſay of theſe who yeeld a complyance to the preſent Eſtabliſhment, which I can ſay of them, the world would ring with it. But I count the defaming of men a work as mean, as it is cruel. Yet I look upon my ſelf as obliged to give ſome accounts of the ſpirit and wayes of theſe people, which I ſhal do with all the

reſerve

reſerve and caution that becomes a Chriſtian.

Eud. Hold, hold, I pray you, run not too far in your carreer, leſt you lay open things were better hid: I confeſs theſe Writers do juſtly draw it from you; but for the faults of two or three, be not cruel to a multitude. And what will all you ſhal ſay avail; for we know well enough how little the cleareſt evidence will prevail upon their belief? And though I in particular, know upon what grounds you can go, for verifying all you undertake, and that they are unexceptionably clear; yet it is a dunghil not to be ſearched too much. Wherefore let me, with my moſt earneſt intreaties, divert you from the diſcourſe you have threatned *Iſotimus* with. But becauſe all theſe mens defences of the reſiſtance ſubjects may make to their Soveraigns, go upon the principles of maintaining Religion and Liberties, when invaded by the Magiſtrat; we will therefore be beholding to you, if you ſatisfie us, whether the late wars, as they were begun and carried on, were defenſive or not?

Phil. Your authority over me is ſo entire, that your commands never fail of determining my obedience, therefore for this once I ſhal yeeld to your deſire, but with this declaration, that if *Iſotimus* cannot prevail among his friends, for conjuring that pamphleting ſpirit

into ſilence, I will be forced on more freedom then I either deſign or deſire: and be made to tell name and ſurname of the Actors of many things, which they may wiſh lay dead: and be made to prove them from authentick papers & records, and diſcover a myſtery of iniquity, which hath lyen long hid under fair pretences: and in a word, let you underſtand what were the arts, cabalings, and intrigues of theſe who pretended ſo much to the intereſt of CHRIST, when they ſought their own: and if in doing this, I be forced on much round and plain dealing, the blame of it will fall to their ſhare who extort it from me. But I come now to ſatisfie your deſire, and doubt not to convince you, that the late wars were an invaſion of the Kings authority, and of the eſtabliſhed Laws, and were not for defence of any part of the eſtabliſhed Religion and liberties.

In the year 1638. His *Majeſtie* having underſtood, that the authorizing of the Service-Book, and Book of Canons, and the eſtabliſhment of the High-Commiſſion Courts, were illegal; did upon the repreſentation of thoſe grievances, not only retract what he had formerly done, but in the fulleſt manner diſcharged them, and though the *Articles* of *Perth* ſtood ſetled by Law, yet upon their petitions, who counted them grievances, he warranted their

their diſuſe: and for ſecuring the fears of his ſubjects of the change of Religion, (with which ſome factious ſpirits had poyſoned them;) he appointed the *National Covenant*, as King *James* had ſigned it, to be taken by all his ſubjects with a bond of mutual defence and adherence to it: He alſo ſummoned an Aſſembly and Parliament, for ſatisfying all the juſt demands and grievances of his ſubjects. But did this ſatisfie the zeal of that party? No, for when all colors of grounds were removed from thoſe malicious imputations, withwhich his *Majeſties* actions were aſperſed; then did they flee to their ſafe and ſure refuge of jealouſies & fears, out of which there was never any ſtorming of them, as if all had been only offered to trepan and deceive them. And after His *Majeſtie* had called a Synod at *Glaſgow*, then came in the Lay-Elders, who were all of the Nobility, and men of the greateſt eminence of the Kingdom, and carried the elections of the members of the Aſſembly in the moſt arbitrary manner imaginable: many inſtances whereof I can yet prove from authentick papers, one general I ſhal only name, (for did I ſtand to reckon up all, I ſhould never get to an end:) the ruling Elders who came from every Parioch to the Presbyteries, for electing the Commiſſioners to the Aſſembly, were men of power, and of

one

one knot; and ſo when it was voted what Miniſters ſhould be choſen, they who were liſted, being at leaſt ſix, were ſet to the door, and thus the Elders who ſtayed within, carried the election as they pleaſed. And when the commiſſionated ruling Elder was choſen, they were all ſo aſſociated, that they could not chooſe wrong. And thus it was, that the ſecular men did intirely chooſe the members of the Aſſembly of *Glaſgow*. But before they went to it, a written citation of the Biſhops was ordered to be read through all the Churches of *Scotland*; wherein they were charged, as guilty of all the crimes imaginable, which as an *Agape* after the Lords Supper, was firſt read after a Communion at *Edinburgh*: and upon it, orders were ſent every where, for bringing in the privateſt of their eſcapes. (And you may judge how conſonant this was to that royal law of charity, *which covers a multitude of ſins*) nor was the Kings Authority any whit regarded all this while. Was ever greater contempt put on the largeſt offers of grace and favor? And when at *Glaſgow His Majeſtie* offered by his Commiſſioner, to conſent to the limiting of Biſhops, nothing would ſatisfie their zeal without condemning the order, as unlawful and abjured. But when many illegalities of the conſtitution and procedure of that Aſſembly were diſcove-

red

red, their partiality appeared, for being both Judge and party, they juſtified all their own diſorders. Upon which *His Majeſties* Commiſſioner was forced to diſcharge their further ſitting, or procedure, under pain of Treaſon: but withal publiſhed *His Majeſties* Royal intentions to them, for ſatisfying all their legal deſires, and ſecuring their fears. But their ſtomacks were too great to yeeld obedience, and ſo they ſate ſtill, pretending their authority was from CHRIST, and condemned Epiſcopacy, excommunicated the Biſhops, with a great many other illegal and unjuſtifiable Acts. And when *His Majeſty* came with an Army to do himſelf right by the ſword GOD had put in his hands, they took the ſtart of him, and ſeiſed on his Caſtles, and on the houſes and perſons of his good ſubjects, and went in a great body againſt him. Now in this *His Majeſty* had the Law clearly of his ſide: For Epiſcopacy ſtood eſtabliſhed by Act of Parliament. And if this was a cauſe of Religion, or a defence of it, much leſs ſuch as deſerved all that blood and confuſion which it drew on, let all the world judge.

It is true, *His Majeſtie* was willing to ſettle things, and receive them again into his grace, and upon the matter granted all their deſires: but they were unſatisfiable; upon which they again armed. But of this I ſhal not recount the parti-

particulars, becauſe I hope to ſee a clear and unbyaſſed narration of theſe things ere long. Only one villany I will not conceal, at the pacification at *Berwick*, ſeven Articles of Treaty were ſigned; but the Covenanters got a paper among them, which paſſed for the conditions of the agreement; though neither ſigned by his *Majeſtie*, nor atteſted by Secretary or Clerk: and this being every where ſpread, his *Majeſtie* challenged it as a forgery: and all the *Engliſh* Lords who were of the Treaty, having declared upon oath, that no ſuch paper was agreed on, it was burnt at *London* by the hand of the Hang-man, as a ſcandalous paper. But this was from the pulpits in *Scotland*, repreſented as a violation of the Treaty, and that the Articles of it were burnt. Theſe and ſuch were the arts the men of that time uſed to enflame that bleſſed Kings native ſubjects againſt him.

But all theſe were ſmal matters to the following invaſion of *England*, *anno* 1643. for his *Majeſtie* did *anno* 1641. come to *Scotland*, and give them full ſatisfaction to all, even their moſt unreaſonable demands; which he conſented to paſs into Acts of Parliaments. But upon his return into *England*, the woful rupture betwixt him and the two Houſes following; was our Church party ſatisfied with the trouble they occaſioned him? No, they were not: for they did

all

all they could to cheriſh and foment the Houſes in their inſolent demands, chiefly about *Religion:* and were as forward in preſſing *Englands* uniformity with *Scotland*, as they were formerly in condemning the deſign of bringing *Scotland* to an uniformity with *England.*

I ſhal not engage further in the differences betwixt the King and the two Houſes, then to ſhew that His *Majeſtie* had the Law clearly of his ſide, ſince he not only conſented to the redreſs of all grievances, for which the leaſt color of Law was alledged; but had alſo yeelded to larger conceſſions for ſecuring the fears of his ſubjects, then had been granted by all the Kings of *England* ſince the *Conqueſt.* Yet their demands were unſatisfiable without His *Majeſtie* had conſented to the aboliſhing of Epiſcopacy, and diſcharge of the Liturgy, which neither his conſcience, nor the Laws of *England* allowed of: ſo that the following war cannot be ſaid to have gone on the principles of defending *Religion*; ſince His *Majeſtie* was invading no part of the eſtabliſhed *Religion.* And thus you ſee, that the war in *England* was for advancing a pretence of *Religion.* And for *Scotlands* part in it, no Sophiſtry will prove it defenſive: for His *Majeſtie* had ſetled all matters to their hearts deſire, and by many frequent and ſolemn proteſtations, declared his reſolutions of obſerving

inviо-

inviolably that agreement: neither did he ſo much as require their aſſiſtance in that juſt defence of his authority, and the Laws, invaded by the two Houſes: though in the explication of the Covenant, *anno* 1639. it was agreed to, and ſworn, *That they ſhould in quyet manner, or in arms, defend His Majeſties authority, within or without the Kingdom, as they ſhould be required by His Majeſtie, or any having his Authority.* But all the King deſired was, that *Scotland* might ly neutral in the quarrel, enjoying their happy tranquillity: yet this was not enough for your Churches zeal, but they remonſtrated that Prelacy was the great mountain ſtood in the way of Reformation, which muſt be removed, and they ſent their Commiſſioners to the King with theſe deſires, which *His Majeſtie* anſwered by a writing yet extant under his own Royal hand, ſhowing, *That the preſent ſetlement of the Church of Engtand was ſo rooted in the Law, that he could not conſent to a change, till a new form were agreed to, and preſented to him:* to which theſe at *Weſtminſter* had no mind: but he offered *all eaſe to tender conſciences, and to call a Synod to judge of theſe differences, to which he was willing to call ſome Divines from Scotland, for hearing their opinions & reaſons.* At that time, petitions came in from ſeveral Presbyteries in *Scotland*, to the *Conſervators of the Peace*, inciting them to own the Parliaments

ments quarrel: upon which many of the Nobility, and others, ſigned a *Croſs Petition*, which had no other deſign, but the diverting theſe Lords from interrupting the *Peace of Scotland*, by medling in the *Engliſh* quarrel: upon which thunders were given out againſt theſe *Petitioners*, both from the Pulpits, and the *Remonſtrances* of the *Commiſſion* of the *General Aſſembly*; and they led proceſſes againſt all who ſubſcribed it. But *His Majeſty* ſtill deſired a neutrality from *Scotland*; and though highly provoked by them, yet continued to bear, with more then humane patience, the affronts were put on his authority. Yet for animating the people of *Scotland* into the deſigned war, the Leaders of that Party did every where ſtudy to poyſon the people with damnable jealouſies of the *Kings inclination to Popery*, of his acceſſion to the *Maſſacre of Ireland*, and of his deſignes to ſubvert by force the late agreement with *Scotland*, if his armies were bleſſed with ſucceſs in *England*. It were an endleſs work to tell all the wayes were uſed for rooting theſe wicked jealouſies in the peoples hearts: neither were all *His Majeſties* proteſtations able to overcome them: yet in end, when *His Majeſty* finding what their *inclinations* were, did refuſe to admit the Commiſſioners from *Scotland* to mediat betwixt himſelf and the Houſes, they returned home; and immediatly upon

that

that, contrary to all the Laws of *Scotland*, a great meeting of *Conſellors*, *Conſervators*, *and Commiſſioners for the publick burdens*, ordained a *Convention of Eſtats* to be ſummoned, which was never before done without the Kings command, except in the minority of the Kings: neither did they ſo much as wait for the Kings pleaſure, but only ſignified their reſolution to him, and deſired *His Commands* againſt the day prefixed. Here was an invaſion of the Kings Prerogative, which deſerved a high cenſure: yet ſo far did *His Majeſties* clemency, and love to his native Kingdom lead him, that he diſpenſed with this tranſgreſſion, and allowed their ſitting in a *Convention*, provided they medled not in the buſineſs of *England*, nor raiſed an army in order to it: But notwithſtanding of this, they voted themſelves *a free Convention*, and not reſtricted to the bounds preſcribed in the Kings Letter, which they refuſed to regiſtrat. And after this, they leagued with *England*. But having ſpoke my ſelf out of breath, I quite the giving account of what follows to *Baſilius*.

Baſil. I have obſerved one defect in your Narration, for which I will be very favorable to you, becauſe I intend to be guilty of that ſame fault my ſelf; which is, that you have ſpoken nothing of the *National Covenant*, and I mean to ſay as little of the *League*. And I am apt to gueſs that

your

your ſilence was deſigned upon the ſame groũds that mine is: for indeed I can ſatisfie my ſelf with nothing I can ſay upon the *League*, except I told all I know of the arts and manner of its contrivance. And truly, I cannot prevail upon my ſelf at preſent, for the ſaying of that. Therefore I will draw a vail over it, and ſay nothing, till I ſee further reaſon for a more full diſcovery; and then I am afraid *Iſotimus* ſhal confeſs, it was not prudently done to have extorted it from me. But to quite this, and purſue the Narration *Philarcheus* hath devolved on me, I ſhal tell you how Commiſſioners came from *England* to treat for an army from *Scotland*, for their aſſiſtance in the war they were then engaged in againſt the King: Upon which all articles being agreed to, and a *League* ſworn, an army was ſent into *England*, which turned the ſcales that did then hang in an even ballance, to the Kings ruine. And truly, my invention cannot reach an argument, or color, for proving theſe to have been defenſive armes, they being the effect of a combination with the ſubjects of *England* againſt our common King. But ſhal I next tell you what followed after the fatal revolution of things in *England*, upon *His Majeſties* truſting himſelf to the *Scots army*, I am ſure I ſhould fill your minds with horror? For though *His Majeſty* offered Conceſſions, juſtly to be wondered

at, he having been willing to quite the *Militia* for diverſe years, and to ſet up *Presbytery* for three years; and that in the mean while there ſhould be a *free Synod*, in order to a final ſettlement with other great diminutions of Royal Authority; which ſhew how willing he was at his own coſt to have redeemed the *peace of his Kingdoms*: only he added, *that his conſcience could not allow him to take the Covenant*, nor authorize it by Law, nor conſent to the abolition of *Epiſcopacy*, or the *Liturgie*; proteſting that how ſoon he could do theſe things with a good conſcience, he ſhould yeeld to all the deſires of his ſubjects: in the mean while, he intreated for a perſonal Treaty, in order to mutual ſatisfaction. Yet with how much fury did that Party preſs the ſetling of the *Government* without him, the diſowning his intereſt, and the abandoning of his Perſon to his enemies; though at that very time, the deſigns of the *Sectarian Party*, againſt both *Monarchy* and *His Majeſties* Perſon, were breaking out, and had been made known to them by thoſe who underſtood them well? What followed upon this, I wiſh my ſilence could bury from the knowledge of all the world. But, alace! it is too well known what infamy theſe men brought upon themſelves, and their Countrey: which in the opinion of the world, was generally held guilty of that which was the crime of the

pre-

prevailing Party, whom the Leaders over-awed and influenced. But after that, when *His Majesty* was made priſoner; when he was carryed up and down by the army; when the army forced both the Houſes, and the City of *London*; when the *Treaties* of *Scotland* were violated in all their articles; when the Propoſitions agreed on by both *Kingdoms*, were laid aſide, and the four Bills ſet in their place, wherein the *Covenant* was not mentioned; when upon *His Majeſties* refuſing of theſe he was made priſoner, and the vote of non-addreſſes paſſed againſt him, then did the loyalty of the *Scots Nation* begin again to revive: and what through the ſenſe of duty, what through the remorſe of their former actings, every one was forward to real reſentments of theſe unworthy indignities put both on *their King and Countrey:* but when the *Parliament of Scotland* had voted the Countrey to be put in a poſture of war for the defence of their *Soveraign*, then where ſhould I end, if I told all the ſeditious Papers, Preachings, and Diſcourſes of ſome of the *Clergy*, who contradicted and countermanded the *Parliament* to a hight of unparalelled boldneſs, even after all their deſires, which they gave in a large *Remonſtrance*, were granted? But did that ſatisfie? No: they then took refuge in their *common Sanctuary* of jealouſies and fears. They threatned

all who obeyed the commands of the *Parliament*, not only with their *Church-cenſures*, but with *damnation*. They did every where incite the people to riſe in armes againſt the *Parliaments* forces: and at a *Communion at Machlin*, they did ſo work upon the vulgar, that they prevailed to get them draw up in a Body, promiſing them great aſſiſtance both from GOD and men. They kept a *correſpondence* with the *Sectarian army*, and continued by many Letters to preſs their ſpeedy march unto *Scotland*; and after the *Scots army* marched unto *England*, and was by the wiſe judgement of GOD defeated. Then did many of the Miniſters, with all the vehemence imaginable, inflame the people to rebellion, and got them to riſe, and they marched before their *Pariſhes* like Captains. They alſo called for the help of the *Sectarian army* to them. And thus did they ſtand to the *Covenant*, *in maintaining the Priviledges of Parliament, and preſerving the Kings perſon and authority*. And when *His Majeſty* was murdered, what attempts made they for the *preſervation of His Perſon*, or for the reſenting it after it was done? This was the loyalty of that Party; and this is what all Princes may expect from you, unleſs they be abſolutly at your devotion. Let theſe things declare whither theſe wars went upon the grounds of a pure defence. But if next to this,

I ſhould reckon up the inſtances of cruelty that appeared in your Judicatories for ſeveral years, I ſhould have too large a Theam to run through in a ſhort diſcourſe. What cruel acts were made againſt all who would not ſign the *Covenant?* They were declared enemies to GOD, the King, and the Countrey. Their perſons were appointed to be ſeized on, and their goods confiſcated. And in the *November* of the year 1643. when ſome of the moſt eminent of the Nobility refuſed to ſign the *Covenant*, commiſſions were given to ſouldiers to go bring them in priſoners, warranting them to kill them if they made reſiſtance. And, pray, whither had this more of the cruelty of *Antichriſt*, or of the meekneſs of JESUS? Or ſhal I next tell you of the *bloody Tribunals* were at *S. Andrews*, and other places after *Philips-haughs?* And of the cruelty againſt thoſe priſoners of war, who bore arms at the Kings command, and in defence of his authority? What bloody Stories could I here tell, if I had not a greater horror at the relating them, then many of theſe high pretenders had at the acting of them? And ſhould I here recount the procedure of the *Kirk Judicatories*, againſt all who were thought diſaffected, I would be lookt on as one telling *Romances*, they being beyond credit? What *Proceſſes of Miniſters* are yet upon record, which have no

better foundation then their not-preaching to the times: their ſpeaking with, or praying before *My Lord Montroſe:* their not railing at the *Engagement*, and the like? And what cruelty was practiſed in the years 1649. and 1650? None of us are ſo young, but we may remember of it. A ſingle death of one of the greateſt of the Kingdom, could not ſatisfie the blood-thirſty malice of that Party, unleſs made formidable and diſgraceful, with all the ſhameful pageantry could be deviſed. Pray, do you think theſe things are forgotten? Or ſhal I go about to narrate, and prove them more particularly? I confeſs, it is a ſtrange thing to ſee men who are ſo obnoxious, notwithſtanding of that ſo exalted in their own conceits: and withall remember that the things I have hinted at, were not the particular actings of ſingle and privat perſons, but the publick & owned proceedings of the Courts and Judicatories. Theſe are the grounds which perſwade me that with whatſoever fair colors ſome may verniſh theſe things, yet the ſpirit that then acted in that Party, was not the Spirit of GOD.

Iſot. Truly, you have given in a high charge againſt the proceedings of the late times, which as I ought not to believe upon your aſſertion, ſo I cannot well anſwer; thoſe being matters of fact, and done moſt of them before I was capable

of

of obſerving things: And therefore when I ſee men of greater experience, I ſhal ask after the truth of what you have told me. But whatever might be the deſign of ſome *Politicians* at that time, or to whatever bad ſenſe ſome words of the *League* may be ſtretched, yet you cannot deny, but they are capable of a good ſenſe, and in that I own them, and ſo cleave to that *Oath of GOD*, which was intended for *a ſolemn covenanting with GOD*: and the people meant nothing elſe by it, but a giving themſelves to CHRIST: to whoſe truths and Ordinances they reſolved to adhere at all hazards, and againſt all oppoſition: and in particular to oppoſe every thing might bear down the power and progreſs of *Religion*, which was the conſtant effect of Prelacy: therefore we are all bound to oppoſe it upon all hazards. And indeed when I remember of the *beauty of holineſs* was then every where, and conſider the licencious profanity, &ſcoffing at *Religion*, which now abounds: this is ſtronger with me then all arguments, to perſwade me that theſe were the men of GOD, *who had his glory before their eyes* in all they did, or deſigned: whereas now I ſee every one *ſeeking their own things, and none the things of JESUS CHRIST.* And all theſe plagues and evils which theſe Kingdoms do either groan under, or may apprehend, ought to be

imputed to GODS avenging wrath for *a broken Covenant*, which though taken by all from the higheſt to the loweſt, is now condemned, reviled, abjured, and ſhamefully broken. Theſe things ſhould afflict our ſouls, and ſet us to our mournings, *if haply GOD may turn from the fierceneſs of his anger.*

Phil. As for theſe Articles that relate to the combination for engaging by arms in prejudice of the Kings authority, or may ſeem to bind us to the reacting theſe Tragedies, they being founded on the lawfulneſs of ſubjects reſiſting their Soveraigns, if the unlawfulneſs of that was already evinced, then any obligation can be in that compact for that effect, muſt be of it ſelf null and void: and therefore, as from the beginning it was ſinful to engage in theſe wars; ſo it will be yet more unlawful, if after all the evils we have ſeen, and the judgements we have ſmarted under, any would lick up that vomit: or pretend to bind a ty on the ſubjects conſciences to riſe in arms againſt their lawful Soveraign. And let me tell you freely, I cannot be ſo blind or ſtupid, as not to apprehend that GODS wrath hath appeared very viſibly againſt us now, for a tract of thirty years and more; neither doth his *anger ſeem to be turned away, but his hand is ſtretched out ſtill.* But that which I look on as the great matter of his cõtro-

ver-

verſie with us, is that the Rulers of our Church and State did engage the ignorant multitude, under the colors of *Religion*, to deſpiſe the *LORDS anointed, and his authority*, and by armes to ſhake off his yoak, and afterwards abandon his Perſon, diſown his intereſt, refuſe to engage for his reſcue, and in end look on tamely, and ſee him murdered. Do you think it a ſmal crime that nothing could ſatisfie the Leaders in that time, without they got the poor people entangled into things which they knew the vulgar did not, and could not underſtand, or judge of, and muſt implicitly rely upon the Gloſſes of their Teachers? For whatever the *General Aſſembly* declared, was a duty following upon the *Covenant* (which was an eaſie thing for the leading men to carry as they pleaſed) then all the Miniſters muſt either have preached and publiſhed that to their people, with all their zeal, otherwiſe they were ſure to be turned out. The people being thus provoked from the Pulpits, they were indeed to be pitied, who being engaged in an oath (many of them, no doubt, in ſingleneſs of heart, having the fear of an oath upon their conſciences) and not being able to examine things to bottom, were entangled thus, and engaged which way the *leading Church-men* pleaſed. And the guilt of this, as it was great in thoſe who without due conſideration engaged

in

in thoſe oathes, ſo it was moſt fearful in them; who againſt the clear *convictions of conſcience*, were prevailed upon by the thunders of the Church, or the threats of the State, to ſwear what they judged ſinful. I confeſs, their crime was of a high and crying nature, who did thus for the love of this preſent world, not only make *ſhipwrack of a good conſcience*, but perſiſted long in a tract of diſſembling with GOD, and juggling with men. But the wickedneſs of this comes mainly to their door, who tempted them to prevarication by their ſeverities againſt all refuſed a concurrence in theſe courſes. And the ſin of all this was the greater, that it was carryed on with ſuch pretences, as if it had been the cauſe and work of GOD, with faſting, prayers, tears, and ſhews of devotion. For theſe things the Land mourns, and GOD continues his controverſie againſt us. To which I muſt add, the great impenitence of thoſe who being once engaged in that courſe of *rebellion*, have not yet repented of the works of their hands. For even ſuch as own a *conviction* for it, do not expreſs that horror and remorſe at their bypaſt crimes which become penitents: But think if by ryoting, drinking and ſwearing, they declare themſelves now of another mind then formerly they were of, that they are waſhed free of that defilement. In a word, none ſeem deeply humbled in the

preſence

preſence of GOD, for the ſinfulneſs of theſe practiſes, into which they entered themſelves, and engaged others. And till I ſee an ingenuous ſpirit of *confeſſing and repenting* for theſe great evils, for all that rebellion, that blood, oppreſſion, and vaſtation which theſe courſes drew on, I ſhal never expect a *National pardon*, for that *National guilt.* For when on the one hand, many are ſtill juſtifying theſe black arts, and not humbled for them, nor owning their penitence as openly as they committed their ſins: And on the other hand, theſe who confeſs the faultineſs of theſe courſes, do it in a ſpirit of traducing others, of railing, and reviling, perhaps not without Atheiſtical ſcoffings at *true Religion*; but not in a ſpirit of ingenuous horror, and ſorrow for their own acceſſion to theſe courſes, it appears we are ſtill hardened, either into a judicial blindneſs of the one hand, or of obduration of heart on the other. That profanity doth much abound, I muſt with ſorrow confeſs it, in the preſence of my GOD: And I know there are many who roll themſelves in the duſt dayly before GOD, and mourn bitterly for it: But when I enter in a deeper inquiry what may be the true cauſes of it, thoſe that occur to me are, firſt, a judicial ſtroke from GOD upon us, for our bypaſt abominations: and chiefly for our hypocritical mocking of GOD, faſtning the

deſigns

deſigns or humors of a Party on him, as if they had been his Ordinances, intereſts, and truths. And therefore becauſe *we held the truth of GOD in unrighteouſneß*, his wrath hath been revealed againſt us. Next, the frequent involving the Land in reiterated oathes, ſubſcriptions, and profeſſions of repentance, under ſevere cenſures, which prevailed with many to ſwallow them over implicitly, and made others yeeld to them againſt their conſcience, hath ſo debauched and proſtituted the ſouls of people, that it is no wonder, they be now, as ſeared with a hot iron, and incapable of reproofs or convictions. Beſides, is it any wonder that theſe whoſe hearts naturally led them to Atheiſm, when they ſee what juggling was uſed about ſome pretences of Religion, and how the whole land was involved in ſo much blood, about ſuch trifling matters, come thereupon to have a jealouſie of Preachers and preaching, as if all they ſaid, was but to maintain and advance their own intereſts and greatneſs, and thereupon turn ſcoffers at all Religion, becauſe of the baſe and irreligious practiſes of ſome, who yet vouched GOD and CHRIST for all they did? And on remark I ſhal offer on the way, that the ſin of your Church was legible in your judgement: their ſin was the animating the people to rebellion, upon colors of Religion; and their judgement was, not

only

only to be ſubdued, & oppreſſed by another rebellious army, who were not wanting to pretend highly to the cauſe of GOD in all their actings: but that they brake in pieces among themſelves about a deciſion, who might be imployed to ſerve in the Army, which at firſt disjointed, and afterwards deſtroyed your Church: and the ſchiſm is ſtill among us, which is like to eat up the power of Religion, is but the dreg and genuin effect of theſe courſes, and ſo all the prejudice it produceth to Religion, and the true intereſts of ſouls is to be charged upon that ſame ſcore.

Iſot. Really, I am much ſcandalized with this diſcourſe, which if it were heard abroad, I know would much offend the hearts of the LORDS people. And indeed, I think it ought not to be anſwered, no more then *Rabſhakeths railings* were by *Eliakim.* I wiſh I could with good *Hezekiah ſpread it out before the LORD, and mourn over it,* and for you who do ſo blaſpheme GOD, and his cauſe. But whatever you may ſay in the point of reſiſtance, yet you cannot deny, but we are all from the higheſt to the loweſt bound in our ſtations (at leaſt) to withſtand Prelacy, againſt which we did ſo formally ſwear in that oath of GOD, which moſt of you are not only content to break, but muſt needs deſpiſe and mock at.

Phil.

Phil. GOD is my witneſs, how little pleaſure I have in this ſevere diſcourſe, into which the petulancy of theſe Writers hath engaged me: but examine what I ſaid from *Religion* and reaſon, and you will perhaps change your verdict of it. For my part, I ſay none of theſe things in a corner, neither do I expect that they ſhal not fly abroad, and if they do, I will look for all the ſeverities which the cenſures and malice of many can amount to. But I will chearfully bear that croſs, and will be content to be yet more vile, for declaring freely what I judge to be GODS controverſy with the Land I live in. If for this love to ſouls, many be my adverſaries, I will betake my ſelf to prayer: and ſhal only add this, that few who know me, ſuſpect my temper guilty either of flattery or bitterneſs. And the ſearcher of hearts knows, that I neither deſign by this freedom, to commend my ſelf to any, nor to diſgrace others, but meerly to propoſe things as they are. If this produce any good effect, I have my deſign; if not, I have diſcharged my conſcience, and leave the iſſue of it with GOD, who can out of the mouthes of babes and ſucklings, ordain ſtrength and perfect praiſe.

As for any obligation you may ſuppoſe the Covenant brings upon us to oppoſe Epiſcopacy, I ſhal diſcuſs it with all the clearneſs I am

maſter

maſter of. I ſhal not tell you, how much many who took that Covenant, and do ſtill plead its obligation have ſaid (from the words of the ſecond Article, and the explication given in it to Prelacy) for reconciling as much of Epiſcopacy as is ſetled among us, to it, according to the declared meaning of its firſt impoſers, when they took it, and authorized it. But leaving you and them to contend about this, upon the whole matter conſider, that Epiſcopacy is either neceſſary, unlawful, or indifferent: if the firſt be true, then you will without much ado confeſs that no oath in prejudice of a neceſſary duty, can bind any ty upon our conſcience. If it be unlawful, I ſhal freely acknowledge that from the oaths of the Covenants, there is a ſupervenient ty lying on us for its extirpation. But if it be indifferent, then I ſay it was a very great ſin for a Nation, ſo far to bind up their Chriſtian liberty, as by oath to determine themſelves to that to which GOD had not obliged them: for the circumſtances of things indifferent, may ſo far vary, that what is of it ſelf indifferent, may by the change of theſe become neceſſary, or unlawful. Therefore, in theſe matters, it is a great invaſion of our Chriſtian liberty, to fetter conſciences with oaths. And though the Rulers and chief Magiſtrats of a Society, have either raſhly or out of fear, or upon other unjuſtifiable

accounts

accounts, ſworn an oath, about indifferent things, which afterwards becomes highly prejudicial to the *Society*, then they muſt conſider that the *Government* of that *State* is put in their hands by GOD, to whom they muſt anſwer for their adminiſtration. Therefore they ſtand bound by the *Laws of Nature, of Religion, and of all Societies*, to do every thing that may tend moſt for the good of the *Society*. And if a caſe fall in where a thing tends much to the good and peace of a Land, but the Prince ſtands bound ſome way or other by oath againſt it, he did indeed ſin by ſo ſwearing; but ſhould ſin much more, if by reaſon of that oath he judged himſelf limited from doing what might prove for the good of the *Society*. Indeed when an oath concerns only a mans privat rights, it tyes him to performance, *though to his hurt*; but the *adminiſtration of Government* is none of theſe rights a Magiſtrat may diſpoſe of at pleaſure; For he muſt conduct himſelf ſo, as he ſhal be anſwerable to GOD, whoſe Vicegerent he is: and when theſe two obligations interfere, the one of procuring the good of the *Society*, the other of adhering to an oath, ſo that they ſtand in termes of direct oppoſition, then certainly the greater muſt ſwallow up the leſſer. It is therefore to be under conſideration, whither the obligation of procuring the good of the *Society*, or

that

that of the Magiſtrats oath be the greater? But this muſt be ſoon decided, if it be conſidered that the former is an obligation lying on him by GOD, who for that end raiſed him up to his power, and is indeed the very end of *Government*: whereas the other is a voluntary engagement he hath taken on himſelf, and can never be equal to that which was antecedent to it, much leſs juſtle it out. But if it contradict the other, the Magiſtrat is indeed bound to repent for his raſh ſwearing; but cannot be imagined from that to be bound to go againſt the good of the *Society*, for the procuring whereof, he hath the ſword and power put in his hands by GOD. And ſo much of the ty can ly upon a Magiſtrat by his oath about things indifferent, in ordering or governing the State that is ſubject to him: in which he muſt proceed as he ſhal anſwer to GOD in the great day of his accounts; and ought not to be cenſured or judged for what he doth by his ſubjects.

But he enacting Laws in matters indifferent, they become neceſſary obligations on his ſubjects, which no privat oath of theirs can make void. Indeed the late Writer his argüing againſt this, is ſo ſubtil, that I cannot comprehend it ſo far as to find ſenſe in it; for he confeſſeth, *Pag.* 232. *That the Magiſtrat is veſted with a power proportional to the ends of Government, ſo that no*

ſubject may decline his lawful commands, or bind himſelf by any ſuch oath, as may interfere with a ſupervenient rational command. All this is found, and indeed all I pleaded; only his explication of *rational*, I cannot allow of: For though a Magiſtrat may proceed to unreaſonable commands, yet I ſee no limits ſet to our obedience, but from the unlawfulneſs of them. But in the next *page*, he cats all this up by telling, *That there are many things ſtill left to our ſelves, and our own free diſpoſal, wherein we may freely vow: and having vowed, muſt not break our word.* And for inſtance, he adduceth *a mans devoting the tenth of his ſubſtance to the* LORD, *from which no countermand of the Magiſtrats can excuſe.* But ſtill he concluds, *Page* 234. *That the Magiſtrats Power may make void ſuch vows as are directly, or deſignedly made to fruſtrat its right, or to ſuſpend the execution of others, in ſo far as they do eventually croſs its lawful exerciſe.* This laſt yeelds to me all I pretend in this caſe: For the *Covenant* being made on purpoſe to exclud *Epiſcopacy*, though at that time ſetled by Law: if *Epiſcopacy* be not unlawful, but lawful, which I now ſuppoſe, then the Kings authority enjoyning it, and it being a great part likewiſe of the *Government* of the ſubjects, it is to be ſubmitted to, notwithſtanding of the oath made againſt it. So that your friend yeelds without conſideration, that which he thinks he denyes:

and

and therefore the reaſoning in the *Dialogues* holds good, that the oath of a ſubject in a matter indifferent, cannot free him from the obedience he owes the Laws. It is true, his *privat vows* in matters of his own concern, are of another nature, and ſo not within the compaſs of this debate, which is only about *the obedience we ow the Laws*, ſuppoſing their matter lawful, notwithſtanding of our compacts made in oppoſition to them: and therefore I ſhal not diſcourſe of them, but ſtick cloſe to the purpoſe in hand. But my next undertaking muſt be to free children from any ty may be imagined to ly on them from the fathers oath: which was a matter ſo clear to my thinking, that I wonder what can be ſaid againſt it.

Iſot. Indeed here your friend the *Conformiſt* bewrayed his ignorance notably, not conſidering the authority Parēts have over their children by *divine command*, which dies not with them; their commands being obligatory even after their death: For GOD commends the *Rechabits* for obeying *Jonadabs* command ſome ages after his death: Therefore Parents adjuring children, they are obliged by it, as the people of *Iſrael* by *Sauls* adjuring them not to eat food till the evening, were obliged to obedience. And ſuch adjurations may not only bind the children adjured, but all their poſterity after them: as

did the oath for carrying *Josephs* bones out of *Egypt*. And further, a *Society* continuing still under the same notion, is bound through all ages to make good the compacts of their *Progenitors*, they continuing to be the same *Society*. And this is not only the ground on which the obligation of all alliances among Kingdoms is founded; but is also the *basis* on which our ty to the *Allegiance due to our Soveraign* is grounded. Therefore as we find GOD in Scripture covenanting with men, and their posterity, as in *Abrahams* case, and fathers likewise engaging to GOD for themselves and their children, as did *Joshuah* for himself and his house; so our *Covenants* being unanimously sworn by almost the whole Nation, and confirmed by all the authority in it, must have a perpetual obligation on all the subsequent generations. *See from pag.* 205. *to pag.* 219.

Phil. I suppose, if it hold good that the *Covenant* binds not these who took it, to oppose or extirpat *Episcopacy* when setled by Law, all this reasoning will of it self evanish in smoak: But to give your discourse all advantage, and to yeeld its obligation on these who took it, what you infer will never be made out; since it is founded on the supposition of a Parents authority to adjure his child, that tyes him after his fathers death, which you apply to the *Covenāt*. But

in

in this there is a triple error committed by you: one of fact, and two of right. That of fact, is, that you ſuppoſe that in the *Covenant* the ſubſequent *generations* are adjured to its obſervance: whereas not a word of this is in the *Covenant*. On the contrary, in the end of the Preface to the *League*, it is ſaid, that *every one for himſelf doth ſwear*: Neither is there a word in it all that imports an adjuraton on *poſterity*. It is true, in the 5. *Article*, every one is bound according to their place and intereſt, to endeavor that the *Kingdoms may remain conjoyned in a firm peace and union to all poſterity*. But he that will draw an adjuration on poſterity from this, muſt have a new Art of *Logick*, not yet known. And in the *National Covenant*, as it was taken by King *James*, there is not a word that imports an adjuration on *poſterity*. It is true, in the *Addition* was made to it, *Anno* 1638. it is declared, *That they are convinced in their minds, and confeſs with their mouthes, that the preſent and ſubſequent generations in this Land, were bound to keep that National Oath and ſubſcription inviolable*. But this was only their opinion who ſigned it: Yet for all that, there is no adjuration on *poſterity* for obſerving it, no not in that *Addition* then ſworn to. The next error of your *Hypotheſis*, is, that the Parents commands can bind the *childrens conſcience*, in prejudice of the Magiſtrats authority: for you

muſt either ſuppoſe this, otherwiſe your arguing is to no purpoſe, ſince the Kings authority is in this caſe interpoſed, and therefore all our fathers commands muſt yeeld to it: which becauſe none deny, I ſhal not ſtand to evince. For if my father be bound to obey the King, as well as I am; both he ſins, if he enjoyn me diſobedience, and I am likewiſe guilty, if upon that I diſobey. For he that hath no warrant for his own diſobedience, can be imagined to have none for ſecuring me in mine. And in end, you ſuppoſe a Parents command or authority can bind the conſcience after his death: which is manifeſtly abſurd: for certainly his authority muſt die with himſelf. It is true, a piety & reverence is due to the memory of our Parents; & ſo much reverence ſhould be payed to their aſhes, that without a very good reaſon, the things they enjoyned ſhould be religiouſly obſerved: but this is not a neceſſary obligation: for circumſtances may ſo vary things, that we may be aſſured, that as our Parents enjoyned ſuch a thing, ſo had they ſeen the inconveniences of it, they had not done it. Now while a father lives, a child hath this liberty to argue with him; wherein it is not to be doubted, but the affection of a Parent, together with the reaſons adduced would make him change his Commands: but indeed did their Commands ty us

after

after their death, we ſhould be more in ſubjection to our Parents, when dead, then we were when they lived: which goeth againſt the ſenſe of all mankind. And what equality is there in ſuch mens reaſons, who will deny abſolute obedience to Magiſtrats, though we be allowed to petition, and repreſent the grievances their Laws being upon us, and yet will aſſert an abſolut and blind obedience due to the commands of our Parents, though dead? Your inſtance of the *Rechabits* makes againſt you, for their Progenitors had appointed them to dwel in tents, yet the fear of *Nebuchadnezar* had driven them to *Jeruſalem*: and conſider if the incurring our lawful Soveraigns diſpleaſure, together with the hazard ſuch obedience may draw after it, be not a juſter ground of excuſing our ſelves from obedience to any ſuch command, ſuppoſe it were real. The *Rechabits* did indeed abſtain from wine, upon *Jonadabs* command, for which they are commended, and bleſſed; and ſo I acknowledge it a piece of piety to obey the commands even of a dead father; yet in that place, it is not aſſerted, that that command tyed their conſcience; but on the contrary, the bleſſing paſſed upon their obedience, ſeems rather to imply that it was voluntary, though generous and dutiful. The ſame anſwer is to be made to *Joſephs* adjuring the chil-

dren of *Iſrael* to carry up his bones; which ought to have obliged even the children of theſe that were ſo adjured, out of the gratitude due to the memory of ſo great a man, eſpecially nothing interveening that rendered obedience to it, either unexpedient or unlawful.

But in general, conſider that when a contract is made, either of an *aſſociation* under a form and line of Magiſtracy, or of alliance betwixt two States, and confirmed by oath; there is an obligation of juſtice that ariſeth from the compact, whereby ſuch rights were tranſlated unto the perſon compacted with: and thereby he and his poſterity according to the Compact, are to enjoy theſe rights, becauſe tranſlated unto his perſon by the compact: but being once legally his, with a proviſion that they ſhal deſcend to his heirs, then his heirs have a right to them formally in their perſons after his death, to which they have a tittle in juſtice, and not by the fidelity to which the poſterity of the firſt compacters are bound by their fathers deed, but becauſe the right is now theirs: ſo that though the firſt compacters were bound by promiſe and oath, their ſucceſſors are only bound by the rules of juſtice, of giving to every man that which is his right: therefore whatever our *Anceſtors* may be ſuppoſed to have compacted with the *Kings Progenitors*, or whatever by Treaty

one

one State yeelds over to another, that *Promiſe, Donation and Oath* is indeed the ground on which the Kings right may be ſuppoſed to have been firſt founded. But now his title to our obedience proceeds upon the rules of juſtice, (of giving him what is his, by an immemorial poſſeſſion, paſſed all preſcription, ſo many ages ago, that the firſt veſtiges of it cannot be traced from *Records*, or certain *Hiſtories*) and not of fidelity of obſerving the promiſes of our *Anceſtors* to him, though I do not deny a pious veneration to be due to the promiſes and oaths of Parents, when they contain in them adjurations on their children. And thus the *Gibeonites* having a right to their lives, confirmed to them by the compact of the Princes of *Iſrael*: they and their poſterity had a good title in juſtice to their lives, which was baſely invaded by *Saul*, and had this aggravation that the compact made with them was confirmed by oath, for which their poſterity ſhould have had a juſt veneration: But though that oath did at firſt found their title to their lives, and their exemption from the forfeiture all the *Amorits* lay under; yet afterwards their title was preſerved upon the *rules of Juſtice*, and the *Laws of Nature*, which forbid the invading the lives of our neighbors, when by no injury they forfeit them. Thus your confounding the titles of inheritance

heritance and preſcription, from the grounds upon which they firſt accreſced, hath engaged you into all this miſtaking. But from all this, you ſee how ill founded that reaſoning of the *Anſwerer of the Dialogues is*, for proving the poſterity of theſe who took the *Covenant*, tyed by their fathers oath, which yet at firſt view, promiſed as fair colors of reaſon, as any part of his Book, had he not intermixed it with ſhameful inſultings and railings at the *Conformiſt*: which I ſuppoſe do now appear as ill grounded, as they are cruel and baſe. But I am not ſo much in love with that ſtile, as to recriminat: nor ſhal I tell you of his errors that way of which I am in good earneſt aſhamed upon his account: For it is a ſtrange thing, if a man cannot anſwer a diſcourſe without he fall a flearing and railing. To conclude this whole purpoſe, I am miſtaken, if much doubting will remain with an ingenuous and unprejudged Reader, if either we or our poſterity ly under any obligation from the Covenants, to contradict or counteract the Laws of the Land, ſuppoſing the matter of them lawful: which being a large ſubject, will require a diſcourſe apart. But I will next examine ſome practiſes among us, and chiefly that of Schiſm and ſeparation from the publick worſhip of GOD; to which both the unity of the Spirit, which we ought to preſerve in the bond

of

of peace, and the lawful commands of theſe in authority, do ſo bind us, that I will be glad to hear what can be alledged for it.

Iſot. A great difference is to be made betwixt ſeparation and non-complyance: the one is a withdrawing from what was once owned to be the Church: the other is a withholding our concurrence from what we judge brought in upon the Church, againſt both reaſon and Religion: & any thing you can draw from CHRISTS practiſe or precept, in acknowledging the High Prieſts, or commanding the people to obſerve what the *Phariſees* taught them, is not applicable to this purpoſe: For firſt, theſe were Civil Magiſtrats, as well as Eccleſiaſticks, and Doctors of the Civil and Judicial Law, which is different from the caſe of Church-men with us. Further, the *Jewiſh* Church was ſtill in poſſeſſion of the priviledges given them from GOD, and ſo till CHRIST erected his Church, they were the Church of GOD: and therefore to be acknowledged, and joyned with in worſhip. But how vaſtly differs our caſe from this? *See from p.* 189. *to p.* 204.

Phil. You have given a ſhort account of the large reaſonings of the late Book on this head, only he is ſo browilled in it, that there are whole pages in his diſcourſe, which I confeſs my weakneſs cannot reach. But to clear the way for

for your ſatisfaction in this matter, which I look upon as that of greateſt concernment, next to the doctrine of non-reſiſtance, of any thing is debated among us; ſince it diſſolves the unity of the Church, and opens a patent door to all diſorder, ignorance and profanity. I ſhal conſider what the unity of the Church is, and in what manner we are bound to maintain and preſerve it.

All Chriſtians are commanded to love one another, and to live in peace together: and in order to this, they muſt alſo unite, and concurr in joint prayers, adorations, and other acts of Worſhip, to expreſs the harmony of their love in divine matters: Sacraments were alſo inſtituted for uniting the body together; being ſolemn and federal ſtipulations, made with GOD, in the hands of ſome who are his Ambaſſadors and repreſentatives upon earth: by whoſe mouthes the Worſhip is chiefly offered up to GOD, and who muſt be ſolemnly called and ſeparated for their imployment. Now theſe Aſſemblings of the Saints are not to be forſaken, till there be ſuch a corruption in the conſtitution of them, or in ſome part of the worſhip, that we cannot eſcape the guilt of that, without we ſeparat our ſelves from theſe unclean things. Wherefore the warning is given, *Come out of Babylon, that we be not partakers of her ſins*

ſins, and ſo receive not of her plagues. But though there be very great and viſible corruptions in a Church; yet as long as our joyning in worſhip in the ſolemn Aſſemblies, doth not neceſſarily involve us into a conſent or concurrence with theſe; we ought never to withdraw, nor rent the unity of the body, whereof CHRIST is the head. Conſider, *how pleaſant it is for brethren to dwel together in unity.* And our Savior ſheweth of what importance he judged it to his Church, ſince ſo great a part of his laſt and moſt raviſhing Prayer, is, *That they might be one:* And this he five times repeats, comparing the Unity he prayed for, to the *undivided Unity was betwixt him and his Father.* How ſhal theſe words riſe up in Judgement, againſt thoſe who have broken theſe *bonds of perfection* upon ſlight grounds! With the ſame earneſtneſs do we find the Apoſtles preſſing the *Unity of the Body, and Charity* among all the members of it: which is no where more amply done then in the *Epiſtles* to the *Corinthians*, whom the Apoſtle calls, *the Churches of GOD*; and yet there were among them falſe Teachers, who ſtudied to prey upon them, and to ſtrike out the *Apoſtles authority:* Some among them denyed the *reſurrection*, there were contentions and diſorders among them in their meetings: ſuch confuſions were from the *ſtrange Tongues* ſome ſpoke, that had one unac-

quainted

quainted with them, come in upon them, he had judged them mad: ſome were drunk when they did receive the LORDS Supper: they had an inceſtuous perſon in their *Society*; and it ſeems he was of quality, and much accounted of, ſince they were puffed up with him: they were alſo a ſcandal to the Goſpel with their litigious Law ſutes. Theſe were great evils, and I hope beyond what you can charge on us: and yet though the Apoſtle commands them to be redreſſed, and rectified, doth he ever allow of theſe in *Corinth*, who were pure and holy, to forſake the *ſolemn Aſſemblies*, till theſe things were amended? Or doth he not highly commend *Charity and Unity* to them? Next, conſider what Teachers theſe were who *preached CHRIST of envy and ſtrife, out of contention, and not ſincerely, that they might add affliction to the Apoſtles bonds:* And yet of theſe *S. Pauls* verdict is, *What then? notwithſtanding every way, whither in pretence, or in truth, CHRIST is preached, and I therein do rejoyce, yea, and will rejoyce.* Now if he rejoyced that CHRIST was preached at any rate, what Spirit have they, who becauſe they ſuppoſe ſome preach out of envy, or deſign to add to their affliction, do thereupon ſtudy to blaſt their *reputation*, and to withdraw firſt the hearts, and then the ears of all from them? Certainly, this is not the Spirit of

Chriſt

CHRIST, or of his Apoſtles. And though we ſee what corruptions had crept into the Churches of *Aſia*, yet in the *Epiſtles* to them in the *Revelation*, they are ſtill called the Churches of GOD, in the midſt of whom the Son of GOD walked. They are indeed commanded to reform any corruptions were among them; but ſuch as *had not that doctrine, and knew not the depths of Satan, but had kept their garments clean*, are not commanded to ſeparat from the reſt: on the contrary, *no other burden is laid upon them*; nor are they charged for not ſeparating from the reſt. From which premiſes I may infer, that as long as the *Communion of Saints* may be kept up, without our being polluted in ſome piece of ſinful concurrence, all are bound to it, under the hazard of tearing CHRISTS body to pieces. And this ſtands alſo with the cloſeſt reaſon; for ſince *Unity* is that which holds all the body firm, whereas *diviſion* diſlocats and weakens it; nothing doth more defeat the ends of *Religion*, and overturn the power of *godlineß*, then *Schiſmes* and *contentions*; which give the greateſt offence to the little ones, and the fulleſt advantages to the common enemy imaginable. If therefore the worſhip of GOD among us continue undefiled, even in the confeſſion of all; if the Sacraments be adminiſtred as before; if the perſons that officiat be Miniſters of the Goſpel,

Goſpel, then certainly ſuch as ſeparat from our publick Meetings, do *forſake the Aſſemblies of the Saints, and ſo break the unity of the Spirit, and the bond of peace.* And what you ſaid of a non-complyance as diſtinct from ſeparation, hath no relation to this purpoſe, where nothing of a complyance is in the caſe, but only a joyning with the *Saints in ſolemn worſhip.* And doth the change of the *Government of the Church,* in ſo ſmal a matter as the fixing a conſtant Preſident, with ſome *additions* of power over your *Synods*, in ſtead of your *ambulatory Moderators*, derive a contagion into our worſhip, ſo that without a ſin it cannot be joyned in? Indeed if a concurrence of worſhip required an owning of every particular in the conſtitution of the Church, a man muſt go to the *New Atlantis* to ſeek a *Society* he ſhal joyn with, ſince few of clear unprepoſſeſſed minds will find ſuch *Societies* in the known Regions of the world, againſt all whoſe conſtitutions they have not ſome juſt exceptions: and the world ſhal have as many parties as perſons, if this be not fixed as the *rule of Unity*, that we cleave to it, ever till we be driven to do ſomewhat which with a good conſcience we cannot yeeld to. And even in that caſe, except the corruption be great and deep, a bare withdrawing, without a direct oppoſition, is all we are bound to. You are therfore guilty of a direct ſeparation

who

who forsake the *Assemblies of the Saints*, they continuing in their former purity, unchanged and unmixed, even in your own principles.

Iſſ. But one thing is not considered by you, which is a main point, that we had our Church setled, according to CHRISTS appointment, and ratified by Law. And a change of that being made, all our faithful Miniſters were turned out by the tyranny of the preſent Powers; who in ſtead thereof, have ſet up a new form of *Government*, of none of CHRISTS appointment: and to maintain it, have thruſt upon the LORDS people, a company of weak, ignorant, ſcandalous and godleſs men, called *Curats*; who inſtead of edifying, ſtudy to deſtroy the flock: of whom I could ſay much, had I a little of your virulent temper: But their own actions have ſo painted them out to the world, that I may well ſpare my labor of making them better known, it being as unneceſſary, as it is unpleaſant. Now if the true ſeekers of GOD do ſtill flock to their old Teachers, and ſeek wholſome food from them in corners, and are afraid of your falſe Teachers, according to CHRISTS command, of being aware of ſuch men; call you this a *ſeparation*? which is rather an adherence to the true Church, and the *keeping of our garments clean* from the contagion of theſe men. And indeed theſe who

do joyn with your *Curats*, do profit ſo little by their Miniſtery, that no wonder others have no heart to it. And I have known ſome whoſe *conſciences* are ſo tender in this matter, that their having at ſometimes joyned with theſe *Curats* in worſhip, hath been matter of mourning to them, even to their graves. And this may ſerve to clear us of the guilt of *Schiſm* in this matter, when our withdrawing is only a *non-complyance* with your corruption.

Phil. All this ſaith nothing for juſtifying your *ſeparation*. As for the turning out of your *Miniſters*, if the Laws to which their obedience was required were juſt (which ſhal be next conſidered) then their *prejudices, misinformed conſciences, or pievishneſs*, and not the tyranny of the Rulers, muſt bear the blame of it. And for theſe ſet in their places, if upon ſo great a deſertion of the Church by ſo many Churchmen, all their charges could not be of a ſudden ſupplyed with men ſo well qualified, or of ſuch gifts and worth as was to be deſired; it is nothing but what might have been expected upon ſuch an occaſion. And for your revilings, they well become the ſpirit which appears too viſibly in the reſt of your actings; but we ſtill ſtudy to bear theſe baſe and cruel reflections, with the patience becoming the *Miniſters of the Goſpel*, and of theſe who ſtudy to learn of him, *who when*

he

he was reviled, reviled not again, but ſtood ſilent at theſe unjuſt Tribunals, when he was falſly and blaſphemouſly reproached by his enemies; and therefore I ſhal leave anſwering of theſe fearful imputations you charge on our Clergy, to the great day of reckoning, wherein *judgement ſhal return to the righteous, and all the upright in heart ſhal follow it.* And in the mean while ſhal ſtudy *to bleſs when you curſe, and pray for you who do thus deſpitefully uſe us.* We truſt our witneſs is on high, that whatever defects cleave to us, and though may be, we have not wanted a corrupt mixture (as you know among whom there was a ſon of perdition) yet we are free of theſe things you charge on us promiſcuouſly, and that theſe imputations you charge us with, are as falſe as they are baſe. But all this will not ſerve the turn of many of your dividers, whoſe Miniſters continue with them as formerly, and meerly becauſe they hold themſelves bound in *conſcience* to obey the Laws they are ſeparated from. Truly if you can clear this of *ſeparation*, you are a Maſter at ſubtil reaſoning. For you know it is not the third part of this Church which was abandoned by the former Miniſters upon the late change, and yet the humor of *ſeparating* is univerſal. And though ſome few of your own Miniſters have had the honeſt zeal to witneſs againſt this *ſeparation*, yet how have

they both pelted for it by the censures and writings of other *Schismaticks*: which hath prevailed so much upon the fear or prudence of others, that whatever mislike they had of these *separating practises*, yet they were willing either to comply in practise, or to be silent *spectators* of so great an evil. But if *separation* be a sin, it must have a guilt of a high nature; and such as all who would be thought zealous watch-men, ought to warn their people of. And what shall be said of those (even Church-men) who at a time, when the Laws are sharply looked to, do joyn in our worship; but if there be an unbending in these, they not only withdraw, and by doing thereby a scandal to others, but draw about them divided Meetings; are not these times for you? For if concurrence in our worship be lawful, and to be done at any time, it must be a duty which should be done at all times: and therefore such *Masters of conscience* ought to express an equality in their ways, and that they make the rules of their *concurrence in worship*, to be the Laws of GOD, and not the fear of civil punishments. Finally, such as think it lawful to joyn in our worship, and yet that they may not displease the people, do withdraw, shew they prefer the pleasing of men to the pleasing of GOD: and that they make more account of the one then of the other. For if it be lawful to *concur in our worship*,

what

what was formerly ſaid, proves it a duty: Are not theſe then the ſervants of men, who to pleaſe them, diſpenſe with what by their own conceſſion muſt be a duty? Beſides, ſuch perſons withdrawing, gives a great and real ſcandal to the vulgar, who are led by their example, and ſo a humor of *ſeparating* comes to be derived into all: whereby every one thinks it a piece of Religion, and that which will be ſure to make him conſiderable, and bring cuſtomers to him, if he be a Merchant or Trades-man, that he deſpiſe the ſolemn worſhip, and rail at his Miniſter: and if he but go to Conventicles, and be concerned in all the humors of the Party, he is ſure of a good name, be he as to other things what he will.

Eud. Much of this we know to be too true: and certainly, nothing deſerves more blame for all the diſorders are among us, then this ſeparation. Diſcipline goes down, Catechiſing is deſpiſed, the Sacraments are loathed, the ſolemn Worſhip deſerted. I know the poor *Curats* bear the blame of all, and all of them muſt be equally condemned, if a few of them have miſcarried; for which when ever it was proved, they were cenſured condignly: In end you charge their gifts; and that their people are not edified by them: But, I pray you, ſee whither the prejudices you make them drink in

againſt them, occaſion not that. For it is a more then humane work, to overcome prejudices. Read but the complaints of the Prophets, and you will confeſs a Church-mans not being profitable to his people, will be no good argument to prove him not ſent of GOD. And when I conſider, that even the Apoſtles call for the help of the Churches prayers, *that utterance might be given to them*, yea and *deſire them to ſtrive together in their prayers for them*; I muſt crave leave to tell you, that the defect of that utterance, and power in preaching you charge on the preſent Preachers, may be well imputed to the want of the concurrence of the peoples Prayers, whom prepoſſeſſions have kept from ſtriving together with them in prayer, that they might come among them *with the fulneſs of the bleſſing of the Goſpel*. And if there be any of ſuch tender and miſled conſciences, who have been ſmitten with remorſe for ſuch concurrence in worſhip, as their tenderneſs is to be valued, ſo their ignorance is to be pitied: and they who thus miſled them, deſerve the heavier cenſure, ſince they have involved ſimple and weak conſciences with their pedling Sophiſtry into ſuch ſtraits and doubts. In fine, you cannot ſay, that a Miniſter is by a divine right placed over any particular flock. If then it be humane, it with all other things of that nature, is within

the

the Magiſtrats cogniſance; ſo that when he removes one, and leaves a legal way patent for bringing in another, upon which there comes one to be placed over that flock, what injuſtice ſoever you can fancy in ſuch dealing, yet certainly, it will never free that Pariſh from the ty of aſſociating in the Publick Worſhip, or receiving the Sacraments from the hands of that Miniſter, whom they cannot deny to be a Miniſter of the Goſpel: and therefore no irregularity in the way of his entry, though as great as can be imagined, will warrant the peoples ſeparating from him. Neither can they pretend that the firſt incumbent is ſtill their Miniſter, for his relation to them being founded meerly on the Laws of the Church, it is (as was proved in the ſecond Conference) ſubject to the Magiſtrats authority, and ſo laſts no longer then he ſhal diſſolve it by his commands: unleſs it appear, that he deſigns the overthrow of true Religion; in which caſe, I confeſs Paſtors are, according to the practiſe of the firſt ages of the Church, to continue at the hazard of all perſecutions, and feed their flocks. But this is not applicable to our caſe, where all that concerns Religion continues as formerly: only ſome combinations made in prejudice of the ſupream authority are broken: and order is reſtored to the Church, in ſtead of the confuſions and divi-

sions were formerly in it. And if this change have occasioned greater disorders, whosoever the defect of policy or prudence may be charged; yet certainly, if the change that is made, be found of its own nature both lawful and good; the confusions have followed upon it, are their guilt, who with so little reason, and so much eagerness, have not only refused obedience themselves, but hindred such as were willing to have yeelded it.

Crit. Indeed this point of withdrawing from the publick worship, for their faultiness who officiat, or for the errors are supposed to be in the way of their entry, doth so contradict the whole series of the sacred rules, that nothing can be more expresly condemned in it. The sons of *Eli* made the people abhor the offering, and they defiled the Tabernacle of GOD; yet for all that, the people continued to come and offer their sacrifices. The Prophets do also tell us what kind of people the Priests in their times were, and yet never a word of the peoples withdrawing from the Worship. Now this must by the parity of reason, hold good under the *New Dispensation*; except you say, we are not so much obliged to worship GOD in the unity of the Spirit, as they were; the contrary whereof will be found true. Next, the *High Priesthood* being entailed on the line of *Aaron*;

was certainly to descend (as all other rights did among the *Jews*) by the right of representation and primogeniture; and so did *Eleazer* and *Ithamar* follow in a line from *Aaron*. It is true, the *High Priesthood* was afterwards in *Ithamars* line, but it doth not appear by what conveyance it went to them, which certainly must have been divine, if lawfull. And none can limit GOD from dispensing with his own positive Laws. But the *High Priesthood* was again set in its own channel by *David*, and so continued downward, till after the second Temple, it becoming the chief Secular Power, was exposed to sale: and this appears from a passage cited by *Doctor Lightfoot* out of the *Talmud* of *Jerusalem*, *in the first Temple the High Priests still served, the son succeeding the father, and they were eighteen on number: but in the second Temple they got the High Priesthood by money. And some say, they destroyed one another by witchcraft. So that some say, there were eighty Priests in that space; some 81. some 82. some 83. some 84. and some 85.* And that learned *Doctor* reckons 52. in order, till he bring the succession down to the time of the wars, after which it was so confused, that he pursues it no further. And in the beginning of the 3. *chap. of his Temple-service*, he proves the High Priesthood to have descended to the first-born, as the Priesthood, before the Law, belonged to the

firſt-born of every family. And therefore, it was that when *Simeon the Juſt* would have put *Onias* his ſecond ſon in the Prieſthood, he could not do it. But *Simeon* the eldeſt brother obtained his right, and *Onias* was put to fly to *Egypt*, where he built a famous Temple. This will prove that the High Prieſts in our Saviors time had no juſt title to their office; and yet our Savior, being by his humiliation in the character of a privat perſon, never queſtioned it, no not when he was upbraided, as if he had anſwered GODS High Prieſt irreverently, which looks like a caſe a confeſſion. And *S. Paul* did the ſame. Now as to what is ſaid of the High Prieſts being a Civil Magiſtrat, it will not ſerve to deliver you; for his title to the Civil Power flowed from his office: therefore the owning him in that, did alſo acknowledge his office, ſince he had no other right to the Civil Power, but becauſe he was High Prieſt, and yet ſubjection was given him by our LORD, who acknowledged the High Prieſt. Did he not alſo continue in the Temple Worſhip, and go thither on their feſtivities? where you know he muſt have offered ſacrifices by the hands of theſe Prieſts: and yet we know well enough what a ſort of people they were. If then we are no leſs bound under the Goſpel to the rules of Order and Unity, then they were under the Law,

Law, it will follow that no perſonal corruption of Church-men, can warrant a ſeparation from Worſhip, even though their opinions were erroneous, and their practiſes naughty: for the impertinency of the diſtinction of *non-compliance* and *ſeparation* was already proved. But next to the Temple-worſhip, was the ſervice of the *Synagogue*, which was for moſt part in the hands of the *Scribes* and *Phariſees*, who expounded the Law to the people: And CHRISTS commanding the people *to obſerve what they taught*, ſhews clearly his pleaſure was, that they ſhould not forſake the *Synagogues* where they taught: And his own going to the *Synagogues*, in which it is not to be doubted but he concurred in the *Prayers* and *Hymns*, proves abundantly that their Worſhip was not to be ſeparated from. As for your friends involved diſcourſe, about the declining of Churches, *Pag.* 193. I muſt let it alone, till I can make ſenſe of it: For if he intend to compare our LORD and his Apoſtles, their joyning in the *Jewiſh Worſhip*, with the miſguided, though ſincere devotion, of ſome holy ſouls who worſhipped GOD with all the corruptions of the *Roman Church*, I hope he will repent the blaſphemy of ſuch a miſtake. And as for what is alledged, *Pag.* 198. that the *Jewiſh Diſpenſation* being mixed, and their Law made up of *matters Political*, as well as

Spiri-

Spiritual, therefore these Scribes were the Oracles of the Civil Law, and so to be gone to, it is as weak as the rest: For the Law being so long from the Priests lips, as to all the parts of it, any power the Priests had of pronouncing about the questions of the Law, was because they were Priests, or as they were men separated for officiating in the Synagogues, so the receiving their decisions in matters judicial, did acknowledge their function, which was purely Ecclesiastical and sacred.

From all this I may infer, that as long as any Society continues to be the Church and people of GOD, and hath the service and worship of GOD performed in it by men solemnly separated according to GOD's appointment, whatever irregularities be either in their entry or such charges, or of their opinions or practises, these should indeed be cognosced upon, and censured by the Supream Powers in the State, but will never warrant privat persons to separat from the Worship, unless it be so vitiated in any part of it, that without sin they cannot concurr in it: in which case, they are indeed to keep themselves clean, and to withdraw, but not to divide until the Worship be so corrupted, that the ends of Publick Worship can no more be answered by such Assemblies.

Poly. I know it is thought a piece of noble gallan-

gallantry among our new modelled people, to
despise the sentiments of the *Ancient Church*;
and therefore whatever I could deduce from
them would prevail little for their conviction:
otherwise many things could be brought to this
purpose from these two great Asserters of the
Unity of the Church, against Schismes and di-
visions, *S. Cyprian*, and S. *Austin*: the latter
especially, who by many large Treatises stirred
the conviction of the *Donatists*, who maintained
their separation from the Church, much upon
the same grounds which are by your friends al-
serted. But I shall dismiss this point with one
sentence of S. *Austin*, lib. 2. *contra Parmen.*
Quisquis ergo ope quod potest negligendo corrum-
pere non potest, salvo pacis vinculo excin-
dat, vel quod salvo pacis vinculo excindere non potest,
separatione improbat, firmitate sustentat, meliori pati-
atur. And let me freely tell you, that when I
consider the temper, the unreasonableness, the
clevish complainings, the railings, the big-swel-
lings of the *Donatists*, which are set down by
him, and others, I am sometimes made to think
I am reading things that are now among our
selves, and not what passed twelve ages ago.
And indeed some late practises makes the pa-
rallel run more exactly betwixt our modern Zea-
lots and the *Circumcellions*, who were a sect of
the *Donatists*, that was acted by a black and a

most

moſt deſperat ſpirit. For *S. Auguſtin* tells us, how they fell on theſe who adhered to the *Unity of the Church*, beating ſome with cudgels, putting out the eyes of others, and invading the lives of ſome, particularly of *Maximinus* Biſhop of *Hagia*, whom they left ſeveral times for dead. And what inſtances of this nature theſe few years have produced, all the Nation knows. How many of the Miniſters have been invaded in their houſes; their houſes riffled, their goods carryed away, themſelves cruelly beaten and wounded, and often made to ſwear to abandon their Churches, and that they ſhould not ſo much as complain of ſuch bad uſage to theſe in Authority: their wives alſo ſcaped not the fury of theſe accurſed Zealots, but were beaten and wounded, ſome of them being ſcarce recovered out of their labor in child-birth. Believe me, theſe barbarous outrages have been ſuch, that worſe could not have been apprehended from *Heathens*. And if after theſe, I ſhould recount the railings, ſcoffings and floutings which the *Conformable Miniſters* meet with to their faces, even on ſtreets, and publick high-wayes, not to mention the contempt is powred on them more privatly, I would be looked on as a forger of extravagant Stories. But it is well I am talking to men who know them as well as my ſelf. From theſe things I may well aſſume that the perſecution

cution lyes mainly on the *Conformiſts* ſide, who for their obedience to the Laws, ly thus open to the fury of their enemies.

Iſot. Now, I dare ſay, you ſpeak againſt your conſcience: For do you think any of the LORDS people have acceſſion to ſo much wickedneſs, which is abhorred by them all: and this is well enough known to you, though you ſeem to diſguiſe it. For you have often heard our honeſt Miniſters expreſs their horror at ſuch practiſes; do not therefore *ſin againſt the generation of the LORDS children* ſo far, as to charge the guilt of ſome murdering Rogues, upon theſe who would be very glad to ſee Juſtice done upon ſuch villains.

Phil. You ſay very far, and I am glad to hear you condemning theſe crimes ſo directly: and I am as deſirous as any living can be, to be furniſhed with clear evidences of believing as much good as is poſſible of all mankind. But let me tell you plainly, that the conſtant concealing of theſe murderers, whom no ſearch which thoſe in Authority have cauſed make, could diſcover, though the Robbers carryed with them often a great deal of furniture, and other goods, which muſt have been conveyed to ſome adjacent houſes, but could never be found out, after ſo many repeated facts of that nature, forceth upon the moſt charitable, a ſuſpicion which I

love

love not to name. Next, let me tell you that these things are very juſtifiable from the principles your friends go upon: for if we be by oath bound to diſcover all malignants or evil inſtruments, that they may be brought to condign puniſhment, & if our *Conformity* be ſo notorious a wickedneſs, and ſuch a plain breach of Covenant, in the puniſhment whereof the Magiſtrat is ſupine and backward, then let every one compare the doctrine of the late Pamphlets (*from page* 282. *to page* 408. *chiefly* 404. *and* 405.) and declare whether by the rules laid down in them, any privat perſons upon herolcal excitations may not execute vengeance on theſe who are ſo guilty of groſs and notorious backſliding and defection, and what may not be expected of this nature from him *who heſitats to call the invaſion of the Biſhop with a piſtol, an undeſired act*, and will only condemn it, *as raſh, precipitant, and of evil example*: and that not ſimply neither, *but all circumſtances being conſidered, and their exigences duely ballanced*. Which makes me apprehend his greateſt quarrel with that deed was, that it miſſed the deſigned effect, and ſo was done inadvertently, or too publickly, or upon ſome ſuch particular ground, which may have occaſioned its miſcarriage. But to deal roundly with you, I ſhal freely acknowledge, if the doctrine of reſiſtence by privat ſubjects againſt theſe in Autho-

Authority be lawful, I ſee no ground to condemn ſuch practiſes: For if we may riſe in armes againſt thoſe in Authority over us, and coërce and puniſh them; why not much rather againſt our fellow ſubjects, and thoſe to whom we owe no obedience, eſpecially when we judge them to have tranſgreſſed ſo ſignally, and to have injured us to a high degree? which is the caſe, as moſt of you ſtate it, with the Miniſters that are conformable. And from this, let me take the freedom to tell you, that the whole *myſtery of Jeſuitiſm* doth not diſcover a principle more deſtructive of the peace and order of mankind, then this doctrine of the lawfulneſs of privat perſons executing vengeance on groſs offenders, where the tranſgreſſion is judged ſignal, the Magiſtrat is judged remiſs, and the actors pretend a heroick excitation. This puts a ſword in a mad mans hands, and armes the whole multitude, and is worſe then theirs, who will have ſuch deeds warranted by ſome ſupream *Eccleſiaſtical Power*, or at leaſt by a *Confeſſarius* and *Director* of the *conſcience*. Indeed this may juſtly poſſeſs the minds of all that hear it with horror, it being a direct contradiction of the *Moral Law*, and an overturning of all the *Societies* of mankind, and Laws of Nature.

Eud. I am more charitable then you are: for though I muſt acknowledge what you have

alledged to be the native conſequence of what is aſſerted in that Book, yet I am inclined to believe he intended not theſe things ſhould be drawn from it, ſince he in plain terms, *Page* 402. condemns theſe outrages. I confeſs, his zeal to defend all *Naphtali* ſaid, and to refute every thing the *Conformiſt* alledged, hath engaged him further then himſelf could upon ſecond thoughts allow of. And as for the inſtances of *Phinehas*, *Elijah*, or other Prophets, the argument from them was ſo fully obviated in our *Firſt Conference*, that I am confident little weight will be laid upon it. But now, me thinks, it is more then time we conſidered the importance of that difference about which all this ado is made: for one would expect it muſt be a very concerning matter, which hath occaſioned ſo much blood and confuſion, and continues ſtill to divide us aſunder, with ſo much heat and bitterneſs. I confeſs, my diſcerning is weak, which keeps me from apprehending what importance can be in it to exact ſo much zeal for it, that it ſhould be called the *Kingdom of CHRIST upon earth, his intereſt, cauſe, and work*, which therefore ſhould be earneſtly contended for.

Iſot. The natural man receiveth not the things of GOD, and they are fooliſhneſs to him: but Wiſdom is juſtified of all her children. That we plead for,

is

is *CHRISTS Kingdom*, which is in oppoſition both to the proud aſpirings of the *Prelats*, and to the violent invaſions of the *Civil Powers*: We are therefore on CHRISTS ſide, aſſerting that none in earth can inſtitut new Officers in his Houſe, but thoſe he hath appointed: and that he hath appointed none higher then ordinary preaching *Presbyters*, among whom he will have an equality obſerved: which whoſoever contradict, with *Diotrephes*, *they love the preeminence*, and *Lord it over GODS inheritance*.

Phil. Though I will not fly ſo high with my pretenſions in big words, yet the iſſue of our diſcourſe will declare if I have not better grounds to aſſert *Epiſcopacy* to have deſcended from the Apoſtles, and Apoſtolical times, into all the ages and corners of the Church who received it: and that there is nothing in Scripture that contradicts ſuch an *Inſtution*. But I ſhal refer the deciſion of this to all impartial minds.

Baſil. Truly, when without a particular examen, I conſider the whole matter in general, I can ſee ſo little to except againſt *Epiſcopal Government*, that I cannot avoid the ſevere thoughts of ſuſpecting the great averſion many have at it, to be occaſioned from the *ſpirit of contradiction* is in many *which luſteth to envy*, or from their oppoſition to theſe in Authority: For I doubt not

but if *Presbytery* had the ſame countenance from the Laws, it ſhould meet with the ſame contradiction from theſe who ſeem to adhere to no principle ſo firmly, as to their *reſiſting the Powers that are ordained of* GOD. But the handling of this, with that fulneſs and clearneſs which the noyſe made about it requires, will take up more of our time then we can be now Maſters of, and may well claim a new *Conference*: Therefore we ſhal remit any further diſcourſe about it to our next meeting.

Iſot. It is agreed to: and I ſhal let you ſee, that for all the railings of this dayes diſcourſe, my patience is yet ſtrong enough to allow of another enterview, though I confeſs my ſelf weary of ſo much bad company, whoſe evil communications are deſigned to corrupt my good principles.

Phil. I confeſs, my wearineſs is as great as yours, though upon a very different account: For I am ſurfetted of the contention and heat hath been among us, and long for an end of our *Conferences* upon theſe heads, which I ſhal now go through once for all, being encouraged to meet with you again, becauſe this pennance is near an end: out of which if I were once extricated, I am reſolved to medle in ſuch contentious Theams no more.

Eud. Having ſwallowed the Ox, we muſt not

ſtick

ſtick on the rump. It is true, your Converſe is extreamly agreeable, yet my ſtomack begins to turn at ſo much diſputing: But, I hope, to morrow ſhal put an end to it: And therefore I doubt not of your return, to finiſh what you hitherto carryed on. And ſo good night to you.

THE FOURTH CONFERENCE.

Iſotimus.

I COME now upon our laſt nights appointment, to purſue this *Conference* to its end, and to examine what theſe grounds are which endear *Epiſcopacy* to you ſo much, eſpecially conſidering the great diſorders and confuſions its reeſtabliſhment among us hath occaſioned. For my part, I cannot ſee what can reconcile the world to it, much leſs what ſhould enamour you ſo of it, as to make you adhere to it, notwithſtanding of all the evils ſpring from it, and of all theſe black characters of GODS diſpleaſure are upon it: which really appear ſo ſignally to me, that it ſeems a fighting againſt GOD, to adhere longer to it.

Phil. Truly, you and I enter on this ſubject with an equal ſurprize, though upon very diffe-

different accounts: For I muſt tell you freely, that after I have with all the application of mind, and freedom of thoughts imaginable, conſidered what could engage ſo many in this *Iſland*, into ſo much zeal and rage againſt the Order, I am not able to ſatisfy my ſelf about it. That venerable Order having ſuch a native tendency for advancing of true Religion, Peace, Order, and every thing that is excellent: that the averſion and prejudices ſo many have drunk in againſt it, ſeem as unjuſt, as unconquerable, and look like a part of GODS controverſie with us; whereby we are blindly carried into ſo much unjuſtifiable zeal againſt that, which if well managed, might prove an excellent mean for reviving the power of Religion, that hath ſuffered ſo great decayes. I ſhal not deny, but on our part there have been great failings, for which GODS anger hangs over our heads: and that he permits all this oppoſition we meet with for puniſhing us for our ſins, which have juſtly provoked GOD to make us *baſe and contemptible in the ſight of the people*. And this I hope ſhal be an effectual mean of humbling us, and of purging us from our droſs: whereby this holy Order being again managed with the ancient Spirit, may appear into the world in its *Primitive luſtre*; and be attended with the bleſſings that then followed it, to the

wonder and conviction of all men. But let me add, the oppoſition ſome fiery ſpirits have given the eſtabliſhment of *Epiſcopacy*, deſerves much of the blame of its being ſo little ſucceſsful in the great work of the Goſpel: for alwayes *bitter envy and ſtrife* produce *confuſion and every evil work*: therefore when you are to view *Epiſcopacy* in its amiable and lovely colors, let me ſend you back to that *cloud of witneſſes*, who for the *teſtimony of JESUS* endured all manner of tormenſts, were torn by beaſts, ſlain by the ſword, burnt in the fire; and in a word, who preached the everlaſting Goſpel through the world. How many Churches did theſe Biſhops found with their labors in preaching, and water not only with their tears, but their blood? how ſublime was their piety? how fervent were their Sermons? how conſtant were their labors? how ſtrict was their diſcipline? how zealous were they againſt hereſies? and how watchful againſt vice? In a word, read but the Hiſtories and Writings of thoſe *great Worthies*, who were by the confeſſion of all men, *Biſhops*, and had more abſolute authority over the *Inferior Clergy*, then is pretended to among us; and then tell me, if you have not changed your verdict of that order. Have there been ſuch men in the Chriſtian world, as were *Ignatius*, *Polycarp*, *Ireneus*, *Cyprian*, *Thaumaturg*, *Athanaſius*, *Baſil*.

Baſil, Nazianzen, Martin, Ambroſe, Chryſoſtome, Auguſtin, and a thouſand more? Theſe were, after the Apoſtles, the greateſt glories of the Chriſtian Church: and were *burning and ſhining lights.* It is in their lives, writings and decrees, that I deſire you to view Epiſcopacy: and if it have any way fallen from that firſt and fair Original, direct your thoughts and zeal to contrive and carry on its recovery to its former purity and fervor: but take it not at the diſadvantage, as it may have ſuffered any thing from the corruptions of men, in a ſucceſſion of ſo many ages; for you know the Sacraments, the Miniſtery, and all the parts of Religion have been foiled, and ſtained of their firſt beauty by their corrupt hands, to whoſe care they were committed. But he were very much to blame, who would thereupon quarrel theſe things. I ſhal therefore intreat, you will conſider that Order, either in it ſelf, or as it flowriſhed in the firſt ages of the Church, and not as prejudices or particular eſcapes may have repreſented it to you.

Eud. That you may both underſtand one another better, let me ſuggeſt to you the right ſtating of that you differ about, that you be not contending about words, or notions of things, which may appear with various ſhapes, and faces; one whereof may be amiable, and another ugly

ugly: give therefore a clear and distinct account of that *Episcopacy* you own and assert.

Poly. Since *Philarcheus* hath appealed to the ancient Church, for the true pattern of *Episcopacy*, I shal faithfully represent to you, what the office and power of their Bishops was, and how it took its first rise and growth among them; and then I shal leave it to be discussed, how lawful or allowable it is of it self. The *Jewes* had among them, beside the *Temple-worship*, which was *Typical*, their *Synagogues*, not only over the land, but through all the corners of the world into which they were dispersed; which were called their *Prosenchæ* among the *Greeks*, and *Romans*. Thither did they meet for the dayly worship of GOD; there did they likewise meet on their Sabbaths, and recited their *Philacteries*, or *Liturgies*, and heard a portion of the Law read; which was divided in so many Sections, that it might be yearly read over: there was also a word of exhortation used, after the Law was read: and there were in these Synagogues, Office-Bearers separated for that work, who were to order the Worship, and the reading of the Law, and were to censure sins, by several degrees of *Excommunications*, casting them out of the *Synagogue*: they were likewise to see to the supplying the necessities of the poor. Now if we consider the practise of our Savior

Savior, and his Apoſtles, we ſhal find them ſtudying to comply with the forms received among the *Jewes*, as much as was poſſible, or conſiſtent with the New Diſpenſation; which might be inſtanced in many particulars, as in both Sacraments, the forms of Worſhip, the practiſe of Excommunication, and theſe might be branched out into many inſtances. And indeed ſince we find the Apoſtles yeelding ſo far in compliance with the *Jewes* about the *Moſaical Rites*, which were purely typical, and conſequently antiquated by the death of CHRIST, we have a great deal of more reaſon to apprehend they complied with their formes in things that were not typical, but rather moral, ſuch as was the Order of their Worſhip: theſe things only excepted, wherein the Chriſtian Religion required a change to be made: And this the rather, that wherever they went promulgating the Goſpel, the firſt offer of it was made to the *Jewes*; many of whom believed, but were ſtill *zealous of the traditions of their Fathers*. And ſo it is not like, that they who could not be prevailed upon to part with the *Moſaical Rites*, for all the reaſons were offered againſt them, were ſo eaſily content to change their other forms, which were of themſelves uſeful and innocent. Now ſince we ſee the Apoſtles retained, and improved ſo many of their rites, and

cuſtoms

cuſtoms, why they ſhould have innovated the Government of their Synagogues, will not be eaſily made clear: eſpecially ſince they retained the names of *Biſhop*, *Presbyter*, and *Deacon*, which were in uſe among the *Jewes*, and ſince they did bleſs and ſeparat them by the impoſition of hands, which had been alſo practiſed among the *Jewes*: and all this will appear with a clearer viſage of reaſon, if we conſider the accounts given in the *Acts*, or rules preſcribed in the *Epiſtles of the Apoſtles*, about the framing and conſtituting their Churches. All which ſpeak out nothing of a new conſtitution, but tell only what rules they gave for regulating things; which from the ſtile they run in, ſeems to have been then conſtituted: and is very far either from *Moſes* his language in the *Pentateuch*, or from the forms of the inſtitution of the Sacraments: And except the little we have of the inſtitution of Deacons, nothing like an inſtitution occurrs in the *New Teſtament*; and yet that ſeems not the inſtitution of an Order, but a particular proviſion of men for ſerving the *Helleniſts* in an office already known, and received. Now let me here ſend you to the Maſters of the *Jewiſh* learning, particularly to the eminently learned, and judicious *Doctor Light-foot*, who will inform you, that in every Synagogue there was one peculiarly charged with the Wor-

ſhip

ſhip, called the *Biſhop of the Congregation*, *the Angel of the Church*, *or the Miniſter of the Synagogue*: and beſides him, there were three, who had the Civil Judicatory; who judged alſo about the receiving Proſelytes, the impoſition of hands, &c. And there were other three, who gathered, and diſtributed the almes. Now the Chriſtian Religion taking place, as the Goſpel was planted in the Cities, where it was chiefly preached, theſe forms and orders were retained, both name and thing: for we cannot think that the Apoſtles, whoſe chief work was the gaining of ſouls from *Gentiliſm* or *Judaiſm*, were very ſollicitous about modes of Government; but took things as they found them. Only the Elder and greater Chriſtians they ſeparated for Church Offices, and retained an inſpection over them themſelves. And abſtracting from what was ſaid about the *Synagogues*, it is natural to think, that when the Apoſtles left them, and died, they did appoint the more eminent to be Over-ſeers to the reſt; which why not every where, as well as was done by *S. Paul* to *Timothy* and *Titus*, is not eaſily to be proven. But this is yet more rational from what was premiſed about the *Synagogue* Pattern; only they did not reſtrict themſelves to that number, for the number of the *Presbyters* was indefinit; but the *Deacons* were according

ding to their firſt original, reſtricted to the number ſeven. Thus the firſt form was, that there was one whoſe charge it was to over-ſee, feed, and rule the flock: and where the number of the Chriſtians was ſmal, they met all in one place for Worſhip, and it was eaſie for the *Biſhop* to overtake the charge. But for the ſpreading of the Goſpel, he had about him a company of the elder, and more eminent Chriſtians, who were deſigned and ordained for diffuſing the Goſpel through the Cities, Villages, and places adjacent: and theſe *Presbyters* were as the Biſhops children educated, and formed by him, being in all they did, directed by him, and accountable to him, and were as Probationers for the Biſhoprick: one of them being always choſen to ſucceed in the ſeat when vacant through the Biſhops death. Now all theſe lived together, as in a little *Colledge*, and were maintained out of the charitable oblations of the people, which were depoſitated in the Biſhops hands, and divided in four parts; one falling to the Biſhop, another to the Clergy, a third to the widows and orphans, and other poor perſons, and a fourth to the building of edifices for worſhip. Thus the Churches were planted, and the Goſpel was diſſeminated through the world. But at firſt every Biſhop had but one Pariſh, yet afterwards when the numbers of the Chriſtians

encrea-

encreaſed, that they could not conveniently meet in one place; and when through the violence of the perſecutions they durſt not aſſemble in great multitudes, the Biſhops divided their charges in leſſer Pariſhes, and gave aſſignments to the *Presbyters* of particular flocks, which was done firſt in *Rome*, in the beginning of the ſecond *Century*: and theſe Churches aſſigned to *Presbyters*, as they received the Goſpel from the Biſhop; ſo they owned a dependance on him as their father, who was alſo making frequent excurſions to them, and viſiting the whole bounds of his Precinct. And things continued thus in a *Parochial Government*, till toward the end of the ſecond *Century*, the Biſhop being chiefly entruſted with the cure of ſouls, a ſhare whereof was alſo committed to the *Presbyters*, who were ſubject to him, and particularly were to be ordained by him; nor could any ordination be without the Biſhop; who in ordaining, was to carry along with him the concurrence of the *Presbyters*, as in every other act of *Eccleſiaſtical juriſdiction*. But I run not out into more particulars, becauſe of an account of all theſe things which I have drawn with an unbiaſſed ingenuity, and as much diligence as was poſſible for me to bring along with me to ſo laborious a work: and this I ſhal ſend you when our *Conference* ſhal be at an end. But in the end of the ſecond

Cen-

Century, the Churches were framed in another mould from the diviſion of the *Empire*: and the *Biſhops* of the Cities did, according to the ſeveral diviſions of the *Empire*, aſſociat in *Synods* with the chief *Biſhop* of that *Diviſion* or *Province*, who was called the *Metropolitan*, from the dignity of the City where he was *Biſhop*. And hence ſprang *Provincial Synods*, and the *Superiorities*, and *Precedencies* of *Biſhopricks*, which were ratified in the Council of *Nice*, as ancient *Cuſtoms*, they being at that time above an hundred years old. In the beginning of the third *Century*, as the purity of Church-men begun to abate, ſo new methods were deviſed for preparing them well to thoſe ſacred functions, and therefore they were appointed to paſs through ſeveral degrees before they could be *Deacons*, *Presbyters*, or *Biſhops*. And the Orders of *Porters*, *Readers*, *Singers*, *Exorciſts* (or *Catechiſts*) *Acolyths* (who were to be the *Biſhops* attendants) and *Subdeacons*, were ſet up; of whom mention is made firſt by *Cyprian*: and theſe degrees were ſo many ſteps of probationerſhip to the ſupream Order. But all this was not able to keep out the corruptions were breaking in upon Church Officers, eſpecially after the fourth *Century*, that the *Empire* became Chriſtian: which as it brought much riches and ſplendor on Church employments, ſo it let in great ſwarmes of cor-

corrupt men on the Christian Assemblies: And then the election to Church Offices, which was formerly in the hands of the people, was taken from them, by reason of the tumults, and disorders were in these elections: which sometimes ended in blood, and occasioned much faction, and schism. And *Ambitus* became now such an universal sin among Church-men, that in that *Century*, *Monasteries* were founded in diverse places by holy Bishops, as by *Basile*, *Augustin*, *Martin*, and others; who imitated the example of those in *Egypt*, and *Nitria*; whose design was the purifying of these who were to serve in the Gospel. It is true, these Seminaries did also degenerat, and become nests of superstition and idleness: yet it cannot be denyed, but this was an excellent Constitution, for rightly forming the minds of the designers for holy Orders; that being trained up in a course of devotion, fasting, solitude, abstraction from the world, and poverty, they might be better qualified for the discharge of that holy function. And thus I have given you a general draught and perspective of the first Constitution of Churches, together with some steps of their advances, and declinings: But I despair not to give you an ampler account, and plan of their rules and formes. Mean while, let this suffice.

Phil. From what you have told us, I ſhal propoſe the notion I have of *Epiſcopacy*, that the work of a *Biſhop*, as it is chiefly to feed the flock, ſo it is more particularly to form, educat, and try theſe who are to be admitted to *Church imployments*; and to over-ſee, direct, admoniſh, and reprove theſe who are already ſetled in Church Offices: ſo that as the chief tryal of thoſe who are to be ordained, is his work, the Ordinations ought to be performed by him; yet not ſo as to exclud the aſſiſtance and concurrence of *Presbyters*, both in the previous tryal, and in the Ordination it ſelf. But on the other hand, no Ordination ought to be without the *Biſhop*. And as for Juriſdiction, though the *Biſhop* hath authority to over-ſee, reprove, and admoniſh the Clergy; yet in all acts of publick Juriſdiction, as he ought not to proceed without their concurrence, ſo neither ought they without his knowledge and allowance, determine about *Eccleſiaſtical matters*. As for the notion of the diſtinct Offices of *Biſhop* and *Presbyter*, I confeſs, it is not ſo clear to me: and therefore ſince I look upon the ſacramental Actions, as the higheſt of ſacred performances; I cannot but acknowledge theſe who are empowered for them, muſt be of the higheſt Office in the Church. So I do not alledge a *Biſhop* to be a diſtinct Office from a *Presbyter*; but a different

degree

degree in the ſame Office, to whom for order and unities ſake, the chief inſpection and care of *Eccleſiaſtical matters* ought to be referred, and who ſhal have authority to curb the inſolencies of ſome factious and turbulent ſpirits. His work ſhould be to feed the flock by the Word and Sacraments, as well as other *Presbyters*; and eſpecially to try and ordain Entrants, and to over-ſee, direct, and admoniſh ſuch as bear Office. And I the more willingly incline to believe *Biſhops* and *Presbyters*, to be the ſeveral degrees of the ſame Office, ſince the names of *Biſhop* and *Presbyter*; are uſed for the ſame thing in Scripture; and are alſo uſed promiſcuouſly by the Writers the two firſt *Centuries*. Now *Iſotimus*, when you bring either clear Scripture, or evident reaſon, for proving this to be unlawful, or unexpedient; you ſhal ſhake my kindneſs to this Conſtitution, whoſe venerable Antiquity hath conciliated ſo much reverence from me to it, that it will be a great attempt to change my value of it.

Iſot. Theſe are all brave Stories well contrived for triumphing among ignorants. But theſe pretences from Antiquity have been ſo baffled by the learned Aſſertors of *Presbyterial Government*, that I wonder how you can ſo confidently vouch them, ſince there is not a veſtige of any diſparity before the 140. year after

CHRIST. And we know the *Myſtery of Iniquity* wrought in the dayes of the Apoſtles, and that then there was a *Diotrophes who loved the preeminence*, and the darkneſs, and obſcurity of the riſe and progreſs of *Prelacy*, doth the more confirm me, that it was the *Myſtery of Iniquity*. The pretence from *Ignatius* Epiſtles, hath been often overthrown; and there are words in theſe Epiſtles which clearly prove them to be the contrivance of ſome Impoſtor, they being ſo inconſiſtent with the ſtrain of Religion, and truth of the Goſpel, not to ſpeak of the Orthodoxy & piety of *Ignatius*, and the ſimplicity of theſe times, which demonſtrat their interpolation evidently, for all the pains *Doctor Hamond* hath been at to aſſert their faith: and therefore theſe can furniſh you with no argument. *See pag.* 145. *and* 151.

Poly. I confeſs I can hear you tell over the arguments of theſe Pamphlets with ſome patience: But truly in this inſtance, I know not how to treat you, or rather him in whoſe name you ſpeak, who yet would earneſtly perſwade the World of the great skill, he and his friends have in theſe things. Surely they are *the men of wiſdom!* And one may as ſecurely pull the hairs out of a Lyons beard, as twil them with the leaſt degree of ignorance. But, pray, tell your *Learned Friend*, that in his next publick appea-

appearance, he medle no more with Antiquity before he know it better, and diſcover not ſo much ignorance, that one of a moneths ſtanding in that ſtudy may laugh at him.

Pray, *Sir*, are you in earneſt, when you tell me that for 140. years after CHRIST, there is no veſtige of Prelacy on record? Will you not believe *Ireneus*, who lived at that time, though he wrote ſome years after, and reckons the ſucceſſion of the Biſhops of *Rome* from the days of the Apoſtles? Or if the Writings and Records of that time be loſt, will you give no credit in a Hiſtorical matter to thoſe who followed that time, and drew their accounts from Writings then extant, though now loſt, ſuch as *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, but eſpecially *Euſebius*, who gives the ſucceſſion of the Biſhops, in the ſeveral great Sees, from the Apoſtles dayes? Certainly, he who was born but about an hundred years after the time you mark, would have had ſome knowledge of ſo great a change. But if there was no veſtige of *Prelacy* before the year 140. in which it firſt appeared, what time will you allow for its ſpreading through the world? Or was it in an inſtant received every where? Were all the pretenders ſo eaſily enflamed to this *Paroxiſm* of ambition? And were all the other *Presbyters* ſo tame, as to be ſo eaſily whedled out of their rights, without one proteſtation

on the contrary? How came the Eclipſe of the Church to a total obſcuration in one minute? What charm was there in *Prelacy* at that time, that the World was ſo inchanted with it; and that ſo ſoon after *S. Johns* death, when *Polycarp*, and many more of the Apoſtolical men did yet ſurvive? And how came it, that all the Churches did ſo unanimouſly concur in the defection, and not ſo much as two witneſſes appeared to fight againſt this Beaſt? Let me tell you freely, there is not a ravery in *Don Quixots Adventures*, or *Amadis de Gaul*, but is liker to prevail on my belief, then this *Romance*. But for *Ignatius* his Epiſtles, the hazard of the iſſue of the debate about them is very unequal: for if theſe Epiſtles be his, then he dying ſo near *S. Johns* dayes, the cauſe of *Presbytery* will be undone. But though they be not his, the Epiſcopal Party ſuſtain ſmal prejudice: For from other traces of Antiquity, it can be made as clear, that *Epiſcopacy* was in the Church from the days of the Apoſtles, as any hiſtorical thing which is at ſo great diſtance from our time. But for your friends exceptions at theſe Epiſtles, they betray his great skill, and tell clearly, that he underſtands not the queſtion, and that he hath never read a page of *Doctor Hamond*, though with his uſual arrogance, he ſlights all he ſaith: For had he read any part of his

diſſer-

diſſertation, he would have made a difference betwixt the old vulgar Edition of theſe Epiſtles, whoſe interpolations that learned Doctor acknowledgeth, and the late Edition of them by the learned *Voſſius*, according to the *Mediceam Codex*, whoſe authority he only voucheth. Now had he known this, would he have cited words out of them, which are not of the true Edition aſſerted by *Doctor Hamond*, but are of the old vulgar and rejected one? Certainly, had he read any thing of that debate, which hath been truly managed with much ſubtil critical learning on both ſides, he could not have ſtumbled unto ſuch a miſtake. But his reading, it is like, riſeth not above Pamphlets; and finding theſe words cited on the ſame deſign, before the late Editions of *Ignatius* came out; he, without examining, took them upon truſt from ſecond hand. But I ſhal not run out further upon *Ignatius* Epiſtles, then to recommend their peruſal to you, and then I am confident you will diſcern ſuch a native, ſimple, and ſincerely pious, and devout ſtrain in them, ſo unlike the ſwelled ſtile, or purpoſes of interpolated Writings, that they will be their own teſtimony for convincing you of their genuineſs: but the exceptions againſt them being ſo fully, and ſo lately, with an amazing diligence, anſwered by *Doctor Pearſon*, I ſhal remit you to his labors, if you intend to

examine this matter accuratly.

Iſot. Your *Conformiſt* did likewiſe alledge the 40. but he ſhould have ſaid the 38. *Apoſtolical Canon*, with a hint, as if 50. of theſe might have been the Apoſtles appointments: though the heap of them is ſo full of novelties, that their Antiquity cannot be pleaded by any who knowes the ſtate of the ancient Church; as appears from the 3. 17. and 25. Canons: and were theſe Canons received, they would prejudge more then advance the cauſe you maintain, as will appear from the 4. 33. 36. and 80. Canons, not to mention the 24. 26. 28. 41. 53. 57. & 75. And in a word, theſe Canons do only allow of a precedency of Order, but not of your Prelatick power & ſuperiority, that claims the ſole power of Ordination and Juriſdiction: *See from page* 148.

Poly. Truly, Sir, if the former exceptions did prove your Author a ſecond hand writer, who voucheth Antiquity upon the teſtimony of others, this doth it much more. For I am ſure had he but read over thoſe Canons, which might be done in half an hour, he had argued this point at another rate: and had he ſeen the Editon of *Dionyſius Exiguus*, he had not accuſed the Conformiſt for citing that Canon, as the forty, ſince it is ſo in his diviſion, who was their firſt publiſher in the *Latine* Church, though it be the 39. in the *Greek* diviſion. But

will deal roundly in this matter, and acknowledge that collection to be none of the Apoſtles nor *Clements*, ſince all that paſſed under *Clements* name was accounted ſpurious, except his firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*. Nor was this a production of the firſt two ages. For the ſilence of the Writers of thoſe *Centuries* gives clear evidence for their novelty: They not being cited for the deciſion of things then in controverſie, wherein they are expreſs, as in the matter of *Eaſter*, the *rebaptizing Heretick*s, and divers other particulars. Yet in the fourth and fifth *Century*, reference is after made to ſome elders rules of the Church, which are to be found no where but in this collection. The Apoſtolical Canons are alſo ſometimes expreſly mentioned: and this gives good ground to believe here were from the third *Century* and forward, ome rules general received in the Church, and eld Apoſtolical, as being at firſt introduced y Apoſtolical men. This was at firſt learnedly ade out by *De Marca Concord. lib.* 3. *c.* 2. and late more fully by that moſt ingenious and curat ſearcher into Antiquity *Beveregius* in his reface to his *Annotations* on theſe Canons. Yet am apt to think, they were only preſerved by *oral tradition*: and that no collection of them as agreed on, and publiſhed before the fifth *ntury*. It is certain, the *Latine Church* in *Pope Innocent*

Innocents dayes acknowledged no Canons but thoſe of *Nice.* And many of the Canons in this Collection, we find among Canons of other Councils, particularly in that of *Antioch*; without any reference to a preceeding authority that had enjoyned them: which we can hardly think they had omitted, had they received the collection (I ſpeak of) as Apoſtolical. And that of the *triple immerſion in Baptiſm*, looks like a rule, no elder then the *Arrian Controverſie.* They began firſt to appear under the name of the Apoſtles Canons in the fifth *Century*, which made *Pope Gelaſius* with a Synod of ſeventy Biſhops condemn them as Apocryphal; though I muſt add, that the authority of that pretended Council and Decree, though generally received, be on many accounts juſtly queſtionable: And yet by this we are only to underſtand, that he rejected that pretended authority of the Apoſtles prefixed to theſe Canons. In the beginning of the ſixth *Century* they were publiſhed by *Dionyſius Exiguus*, who prefixed fifty of them to his tranſlation of the *Greek Canons*; but he confeſſes they were much doubted by many. At the ſame time they were publiſhed in the *Greek Church* with the addition of thirty-five more Canons, and were acknowledged generally. *Juſtinian* cites them often in the *Novels*, and in the ſixth *Novel* calls them, the Ca-

ons of the holy Apoſtles, kept and interpre-
ed by the Fathers. And the ſame authority
was aſcribed to them by the Council in *Trullo*.
Theſe things had been pertinently alledged if
you had known them, but for your friends
niblings at them, if you will but give your ſelf
he trouble of reading theſe Canons, you will
be aſhamed of his weakneſs, who manageth his
advantage ſo ill. And to inſtance this but in one
particular, had he read theſe Canons himſelf,
could he have cited the eighty which is among
he latter additions, & paſſed by the ſixth, which
is full to the ſame purpoſe? But for that impu-
dent allegation, as if a bare precedency had
been only aſcribed to Biſhops by theſe Canons,
look but on the 14. the 30. 37. 40. 54. and 73.
and then paſs your verdict on your friends in-
genuity, or his knowledge. By the 14. *No Church-man may paſs from one Pariſh to another without his Biſhops ſentence, otherwiſe he is ſuſpended from Eccleſiaſtical functions: and if he refuſe to return, when required by his Biſhop, he is to be accounted a Church-man no more.* By the 30. *A Presbyter, who in contempt of his Biſhop gathers a Congregation apart, having nothing to condemn is Biſhop of, either as being unholy or unjuſt, he is to be depoſed, as one that is ambitious, and tyrannous; and ſuch of the Clergy or Laity as joyn with them, are likewiſe to be cenſured.* By the 37. *The Biſhop*

hath

hath the care of all Church matters, which he muſt adminiſtrat as in the ſight of God. By the 39. *The Biſhop hath power over all the goods of the Church; and the reaſon given is, that ſince the precious ſouls of men are committed to him, it is much more juſt he have the charge of the goods of the Church.* By the 54. *If a Clergy man reproach their Biſhop, he is to be depoſed, for it is written, thou ſhalt not curſe the ruler of thy people.* And by the 73. *A Biſhop, when accuſed, is only to be judged of by other Biſhops.* Now from theſe hints, judge whither there be truth in that aſſertion, that only a precedency is aſſerted in theſe Canons: and if all the power is now pleaded for, be not there held out; not to mention the Canon was cited by the *Conformiſt*, that Presbyters or Deacons might finiſh nothing without the Biſhops ſentence, ſince the ſouls of the people are truſted to him. As for the ſole power of Ordination and Juriſdiction, I am ſure none among us do claim it, but willingly allow the Presbyters a concurrence in both theſe. And as to what your friend ſayeth of *Cyprian*, it is of a piece with the learning and ingenuity that runneth through the reſt of his diſcourſe, *from page* 150. *to page* 160. where for divers pages he belabors his Reader with brave ſhowes of learning and high invention, ſo that no doubt he thinks he hath performed wonders, and fully ſatisfied every ſcruple con-

concerning the riſe and progreſs of Epiſcopacy.

Iſot. I pray you, do not fly too high, and make not too much ado about any ſmal advantages you conceive you have of my friend: but upon the whole matter I am willing to believe there was a precedency pretty early begun in the Church, which I ſhal not deny was uſeful and innocent, though a deviation from the firſt pattern: Neither ſhal I deny, that holy men were of that Order: but when it is conſidered what a ſtep even that precedency was to Lordly Prelacy, and how from that the *ſon of perdition* roſe up to his pretence of Supremacy; we are taught how unſafe it is to change any thing in the Church, from the firſt inſtitution of its bleſſed Head, who knew beſt what was fit for it, according to whoſe will all things in it ſhould be managed.

Poly. It hath been often repeated, that nothing was ever ſo ſacred, as to eſcape that to which all things, when they fall in the hands of mortals, are obnoxious. And may not one that quarrels a ſtanding Miniſtery, argue on the ſame grounds, a Miniſters authority over the people, gave the riſe to the authority Biſhops pretend over Miniſters, and ſo the Miniſtery will be concluded the firſt ſtep of the beaſts Throne? Or may not the authority your Judicatories

catories pretend to be at the ſame rate ſtruck out, ſince from leſſer Synods ſprung greater ones, from Provincial roſe Generals, and from theſe Oecumenical ones with the pretence of infallibility? But to come nearer you, that whole frame of *Metropolitans* and *Patriarchs* was taken from the diviſion of the *Roman Empire*, which made up but one great National Church; and ſo no wonder the Biſhop of the Imperial City of that *Empire*, was the *Metropolitan* of that Church: yet he was not all that neither, ſince he had no authority over his fellow *Patriarchs*, being only the firſt in order, which truly were the Biſhops of that Church: what they were for the firſt four ages, it was never judged an abſurdity to grant to them ſtill: though the ruine of the *Roman Empire*, and its diviſion into ſo many Kingdoms, which are conſtituted in various National Churches, do alter the preſent frame of *Europe* ſo entirely, from what was then; that with very good reaſon what was then ſubmitted to, on the account of the Unity of the *Empire*, may be now undone by reaſon of the ſeveral Kingdoms, which are National Churches within themſelves; and need not to own ſo much as the acknowledgment of Primacy to any, but to the *Metropolitan* of their own Kingdom. And it ſeems the intereſt of Princes, as well as Churches, to aſſert this. But for the pretence of the Popes ſupre-

macy

nacy, *Epiſcopacy* was ſo far from being judged ſtep to it, that the ruine of the *Epiſcopal* autho-ity over *Presbyters*, and the granting them ex-mptions from the Juriſdiction of their ordina-y, was the greateſt advance the *Roman Biſhop* ver made in his tyrannical uſurpation over Churches. I need not here tell ſo known a mat-er, as is that of the *exemption of the Regulars*, who being ſubject to their own Superiors and Generals, and by them to the Pope, were ſent hrough the World in ſwarms; and with great hows of piety, devotion, and poverty, carryed way all the eſteem and following from the ſe-ular Clergy; who were indeed become too ſe-ular, and theſe were the Popes *Agents* and *Emiſſaries*, who brought the world to receive he *mark of the Beaſt*, *and wonder at her.* For efore that time, the Popes found more diffi-culty to carry on their pretenſions, both from ecular Princes and Biſhops: But theſe Regu-ars being warranted to preach and adminiſter he Sacraments without the Biſhops licence, or eing ſubject and accountable to him; as they rought the Biſhops under great contempt, ſo hey were the Popes chief confidents in all their reaſonable plots againſt the Princes of *Europe.* And when at the *Council of Trent*, the Biſhops of *Spain* being weary of the inſolencies of the Re-gulars, and of the Papal yoak, deſigned to get free

free from it. The great mean they propoſed was to get *Epiſcopacy* declared to be of *divine right*, which would have ſtruck out both the one and the other. But the Papal Party fore-ſaw this well, and oppoſed it with all the artifice imaginable: and *Lainez* the Jeſuit, did at large diſcourſe againſt it; and they carryed it ſo, that it was not permitted to be declared of *divine right*. And by this, judge if it be likely that the Papacy owes its riſe to *Epiſcopacy*, ſince the declaring it to be of *divine right*, was judged one of the greateſt blows the Papal Dominion could have received, as the abuſing of the *Epiſcopal* authority, was the greateſt ſtep to its exaltation.

Iſot. Be in theſe things what may be, I am ſure *from the beginning it was not ſo*, ſince CHRIST did ſo expreſly prohibit all dominion and authority among his Diſciples, when he ſaid, *But it ſhall not be ſo among you: but whoſoever will be great among you, let him be your miniſter*, *Luke* 22. 26. Whereby he did not only condemn a tyrannical domination, but ſimply all authority, like that the *Lords of the Gentils exerciſed over them*. *See page* 88.

Crit. I confeſs, the advantages ſome have drawn from theſe words of CHRIST, for deciding this queſtion, have many times appeared ſtrange to me, their purpoſe being ſo viſibly

visibly different from that to which they are applyed. But if we examine the occasion that drew these words from CHRIST, it will furnish us with a key for understanding them aright: and that was the frequent contentions were among the Disciples about the precedency in the Kingdom of CHRIST: for they were in the vulgar *Judaical error*, who believed the *Messiah* was to be a temporal Prince, and so understood all the pompous promises of the *New Dispensation* literally, and thought that CHRIST should have restored *Israel* in the literal meaning: therefore they begun to contend who should be preferred in his Kingdom: and the wife of *Zebedee* did early bespeak the chief preferments for her sons. Yea, we find them sticking to this mistake even at CHRISTS Ascension, by the question then moved, concerning *his restoring the Kingdom at that time to Israel.* Now these contentions, as they sprung from an error of their judgements, so also they took their rise from their proud ambition. And for a check to both, our Savior answers them, by telling the difference was to be betwixt his Kingdom, and the Kingdoms of the Nations: these being exercised by Grandeur and temporal Authority, whereas his Kingdom was spiritual, and allowed nothing of that; since Churchmen have not by CHRIST a Lordly or

Deſpotick dominion over Chriſtians committed to them; but a paternal and brotherly one; by which in commanding, they ſerve their flock; ſo that it is both a *Miniſtery* and an *Authority*. Therefore the words of CHRIST, *it ſhal not be ſo among you*, relate nothing to the degrees or ranks of Church-men, but to the nature of their power and juriſdiction over their flock, and not to their degrees among themſelves, which appears evidently from the whole contexture of the words. And that he is not ſpeaking of any equality among Church-men in their Church power, appears from the mention is made of the *greateſt*, and *the chief*; *He that is greateſt among you, let him be as the younger*; *and he that is chief, as he that doth ſerve:* which ſhow he was not here deſigning to ſtrike out the degrees of ſuperiority, when he makes expreſs mentiõ of them; but to intimat that the higher the degrees of *Eccleſiaſtical Offices* did raiſe them, they were thereby obliged to the more humility, and the greater labor. All which is evidently confirmed by the inſtance he gives of himſelf, which ſhews ſtill he is not meaning of Church power (ſince he had certainly the higheſt *Eccleſiaſtical authority*) but only of Civil dominion; nothing of which he would aſſume. And if this place be to be applyed to Church power, then it will rather prove too much, that there ſhould be no power at all among

among Church-men over other Christians: For since the paralel runs betwixt the Disciples, and the Lords of the *Gentils*; it will run thus, that though the Lords of the *Gentils* bear rule over their people, yet you must not over yours: so that this must either be restricted to *Civil Authority*, or else it will quite strike out all *Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction*. But how this should be brogh to prove that there may not be several ranks in Church Offices, I cannot yet imagine. And as it is not thought contrary to this, that a Minister is over your Lay Elders and Deacons, why should it be more contrary to it, that a rank of Bishops be over Ministers? In a word, since we find the Apostles exercising this paternal authority over other Church-men, it will clearly follow they understood not CHRIST, as hereby meaning to discharge the several ranks of Church-men, with different degrees of power. But to tell you plainly what by these words of CHRIST is clearly forbidden, I acknowledge that chiefly the Popes pretence to the *Temporal Dominion* over Christendom, whither directly or indirectly, as the Vicar of CHRIST, is expressly condemned. Next, all Church-men under what notion, or in what Judicatory soever, are condemned, who study upon a pretence of the Churches intrinsick power, to possess themselves of the authority, to determine

about obedience due to Kings or Parliaments, and who bring a tyranny on the Chriſtians, and procure what by arts, what by power, the ſecular arm to ſerve at their beck. Whither this was the practiſe of the late *General Aſſemblies*, or not, I leave it to all who are ſo old, as to remember how ſquares went then; and if the leading men at that time, had not really the ſecular power ready to lacquay at their commands, ſo that they ruled in the *ſpirit of the Lords of the Gentils*, whatever they might have pretended. And the following change of Government did fully prove, that the obedience which was univerſally given to their commands, was only an appendage of the Civil Power, which was then directed by them: For no ſooner was the power invaded by the *Uſurper*, who regarded their Judicatories little, but the obedience payed to their Decrees evaniſhed. Thus, I ſay, theſe who build all their pretences to parity on their miſtakes of theſe words, did moſt ſignally deſpiſe and neglect them in their true and real meaning. Now think not to retort this on any additions of *Secular Power*, which the munificence of Princes may have annexed to the *Epiſcopal* Office; for that is not at all condemned here: CHRIST ſpeaking only of the power Church-men, as ſuch, derived from him their Head, which only barrs all pretenſions to *Civil*

Power

Power on the title of their functious; but doth not ſay that their functions render them incapable of receiving any *Secular Power*, by a ſecular conveyance from the *Civil Magiſtrat*. And ſo far have I conſidered this great and pompous argument againſt precedency in the Church; and am miſtaken if I have not ſatisfied you of the ſlender foundations it is built upon: all which is alſo applicable to *S. Peters* words, of not *Lording it over their flocks*.

Iſot. You are much miſtaken, if you think that to be the great foundation of our belief of a parity among Church-men, for I will give you another, (*page* 91.) which is this, that JESUS CHRIST the head of his Church, did inſtitute a ſettled Miniſtery in his Church, to feed and over-ſee the flock, to preach, to reprove, to bind, looſe, &c. It is true, he gave the Apoſtles many ſingular things beyond their Succeſſors, which were neceſſary for that time, and work, and were to expire with it: But as to their Miniſterial Power which was to continue, he ma[illegible]l equal. The Apoſtles alſo acknowledged the Paſtors of the Churches, their fellow-laborers, and Brethren. And the feeding and overſeeing the flock, are duties ſo complicated together, that it is evident none can be fitted for the one, without they have alſo authority for the other. And therefore all who

have a power to preach, muſt alſo have a right to govern, ſince Diſcipline is referable to preaching, as a mean to its end: preaching being the great end of the Miniſtery. Theſe therefore who are ſent upon that work, muſt not be limited in the other: neither do we ever find CHRIST inſtituting a ſuperior Order over preaching *Presbyters*, which ſhows he judged it not neceſſary: And no more did the Apoſtles, though they withheld none of the counſel of GOD from the flock. Therefore this ſuperior Order uſurping the power from the preaching Elders, ſince it hath neither warrant, nor inſtitution in Scripture, is to be rejected, as an invaſion of the rights of the Church. In fine, the great advantage our plea for parity hath, is that it proves it ſelf, till you prove a diſparity. For ſince you acknowledge it to be of *divine right*, that there be Officers in the Houſe of GOD; except you prove the inſtitution of ſeveral Orders, an equality among them muſt be concluded. And upon theſe accounts it is that we cannot acknowledge the lawfulneſs of Prelacy.

Phil. I am ſure, if your friends had now heard you, they would for ever abſolve you from deſigning to betray their cauſe by a faint Patrociny; ſince you have in a few words laid out all their forces: but if you call to mind what hath

hath been already ſaid, you will find moſt of what you have now pleaded, to be anſwered before hand. For I acknowledged *Biſhop* and *Presbyter*, to be one and the ſame Office; and ſo I plead for no new Office-Bearers in the Church. Next, in our *ſecond Conference*, the power given to Church-men was proved to be double. The firſt branch of it, is their authority to publiſh the Goſpel, to manage the Worſhip, and to diſpenſe the Sacraments. And this is all that is of *divine right* in the Miniſtery, in which *Biſhops* and *Presbyters* are equal ſharers, both being veſted with this power. But beſide this, the Church claims a power of Juriſdiction, of making rules for diſcipline, and of applying and executing the ſame; all which is indeed ſutable to the common Laws of *Societies*, and to the general rules of Scripture, but hath no poſitive warrant from any Scripture precept. And all theſe Conſtitutions of Churches into Synods, and the Canons of diſcipline, taking their riſe from the diviſions of the world into the ſeveral Provinces, and beginning in the end of the ſecond, and beginning of the third *Century*, do clearly ſhew they can be derived from no divine Original; and ſo were, as to their particular form, but of humane Conſtitution: therefore as to the management of this Juriſdiction, it is in the Churches power to caſt it in what mould

ſhe will: and if ſo, then the conſtant practiſe of the Church for ſo many ages ſhould determine us, unleſs we will pretend to underſtand the exigencies and conveniencies of it better then they who were neareſt the Apoſtolical time. But we ought to be much more determined by the *Laws of the Land*, which in all ſuch matters have a power to bind our conſciences to their obedience, till we prove the matter of them ſinful. Now diſcover where the guilt lyes of fixing one over a Tract of ground, who ſhal have the chief inſpection of the *Miniſtery*, and the greateſt authority in matters of Juriſdiction, ſo that all within that Precinct be governed by him, with the concurring votes of the other *Presbyters*: if you ſay, that thereby the Miniſters may be reſtrained of many things, which otherwiſe the good of the Church requires to be done. I anſwer, theſe are either things neceſſary to be done by divine precept, or not: if the former, then ſince no power on earth can cancel the authority of the *divine Law*, ſuch reſtraints are not to he conſidered. But if the things be not neceſſary, then the Unity and Peace of the Church is certainly preferable to them. I acknowledge a *Biſhop* may be tyrannical, and become a great burden to his *Presbyters*; but, pray, may not the ſame be apprehended from Synods? And remember your friends,

how

how long it is, ſince they made the ſame complaints againſt the Synods: and the hazard of an ill Biſhop is neither ſo fixed, nor ſo laſting, as that of a bad Synod. For a Biſhop may die, and a good one ſucceed: but when a Synod is corrupt, they who are the major part, are careful to bring in none, but ſuch as are ſure to their way; whereby they propagat their corruption more infallibly, then a Biſhop can do. And what if the Lay ruling Elders ſhould bend up the ſame plea againſt the Miniſters, who do either aſſume *a Negative* over them directly, or at leaſt do what is equivalent, and carry every thing to the *Presbytery, Synod,* or *General Aſſembly*, where they are ſure to carry it againſt the Lay Elders, they being both more in number, and more able with their learning and eloquence to confound the others? But ſhould a Lay Elder plead thus againſt them, *We are Office-Bearers inſtituted by CHRIST, for ruling the flock, as well as you, and yet you take our power from us; for whereas in our Church Seſſions, which are of CHRIST appointment, we are the greater number, being generally twelve to one; you Miniſters have got a device, to turn us out of the power: for you allow but one of us to come to your Synods, and Presbyteries, and but one of a whole Presbytery to go to a National Synod; whereby you ſtrike the reſt of us out of our power: and thus you aſſert a preemi-*

nence

nence over us, to carry matters as you pleaſe? Now *Iſotimus*, when in your principles you anſwer this, I will undertake on all hazards to ſatisfie all you can ſay, even in your own principles. Next, may not one of the Congregational way, talk at the ſame rate, and ſay, *CHRIST hath given his Office-Bearers full power to preach, feed, and overſee the flock; and yet for all that, their power of overſeeing is taken from them; and put in the hands of a multitude, who being generally corrupt themſelves, and luſting to envy, will ſuffer none to outſtrip them: but are tyrannical over any they ſee minding the work of the Goſpel more then themſelves? And muſt this uſurpation be endured and ſubmitted to?* And let me ask you freely, what imaginable device will be fallen upon, for ſecuring the Church from the tyranny of Synods, unleſs it be either by the Magiſtrats power, or by ſelecting ſome eminent Church-men, who ſhall have ſome degrees of power beyond their brethren? In a word, I deny not, but as in *Civil Governments*, there is no form upon which great inconveniencies may not follow; ſo the ſame is unavoidable in *Eccleſiaſtical Government*. But as you will not deny, Monarchy to be the beſt of Governments, for all the hazards of tyranny from it; ſo I muſt crave leave to have the ſame impreſſions of *Epiſcopacy*.

Crit. But ſuffer me to add a little for checking

ing *Isotimus* his too positive asserting of parity rom the *New Testament*; for except he find a recept for it, his Negative authority will ne- er conclude it: and can only prove a parity awful, and that imparity is not necessary. I hal acknowledge that without Scripture war- ants, no new Offices may be instituted; but without that, in order to Peace, Unity, De- ency, and Edification, several ranks and dig- nities in the same Office, might well have been introduced: whereby some were to be empo- wered either by the Churches choice, or the Kings authority, as overseers, or inspectors of the rest: who might be able to restrain them in the exercise of some parts of their functions, which are not immediatly commanded by GOD. And you can never prove it unlawful, that any should oversee, direct, and govern Church-men, without you prove the Apostol- lical function unlawful: for what is unlawful, and contrary to the rules of the Gospel, can upon no occasion, and at no time become law- ful: since then both the Apostles, and the Evan- gelists exercised authority over *Presbyters*; it cannot be contrary to the Gospel rules, that some should do it. To pretend that this superio- rity was for that exigent, and to die with that age, is a meer allegation without ground from Scripture: for if by our LORDS words, *it*

shal

ſhal not be ſo among you, all ſuperiority among Church-men was forbid, how will you clear the Apoſtles from being the firſt tranſgreſſors of it? And further, if upon that exigent ſuch ſuperiority was lawful, then upon a great exigent of the Church, a ſuperiority may be ſtill lawful. Beſides, it is aſſerted, not proved, that ſuch an authority as *S. Paul* left with *Timothy* and *Titus*, was to die with that age: for where the reaſon of an appointment continues, it will follow, that the Law ſhould alſo be coëval with the ground on which it was firſt enacted: if then there be a neceſſity that Church-men be kept in order, as well as other Chriſtians; and if the more exalted their Office be, they become the more ſubject to corruption, and corruptions among them be both more viſible, and more dangerous then they are in other perſons; the ſame parity of reaſon that enjoyns a Juriſdiction to be granted to Church-men over the faithful, will likewiſe determine the fitneſs of granting ſome excreſſing power to the more venerable and approved of the Clergy over others; neither is this a new Office in the Houſe of GOD, but an eminent rank of the ſame Office.

Iſot. You ſtudy to preſent *Epiſcopacy* in as harmleſs a poſture as can be, yet that it is a diſtinct Office, is apparent by the ſole claim of

Ordi-

Ordination and *Juriſdiction* they pretend to, and by their conſecration to it, which ſhowes they account it a ſecond Order: beſides, that they do in all things carry as theſe who conceit themſelves in a Region above the *Presbyters*.

Phil. I am not to vindicat neither all the practiſes, nor all the pretenſions of ſome who have aſſerted this Order, no more then you will do the opinions or actings of all your party: which when you undertake, then I allow you to charge me with what you will. But it is a different thing to ſay, that no Ordination, nor greater act of Juriſdiction, ſhould paſs without the Biſhops conſent, or concurrence (which is all I ſhal pretend to, and is certainly moſt neceſſary for preſerving of Order and Peace) from aſſerting that the ſole power for theſe ſtands in the Biſhops perſon. And though I do hold it ſchiſmatical to ordain without a Biſhop, where he may be had, yet I am not to annul theſe Ordinations that paſs from *Presbyters*, where no *Biſhop* can be had: and this layes no claim to a new Office, but only to a higher degree of inſpection in the ſame Office; whereby the exerciſe of ſome acts of *Juriſdiction* are reſtrained to ſuch a method; and this may be done either by the Churches free conſent, or by the Kings authority. As for the conſecration of *Biſhops* by a new Impoſition of hands, it doth not prove

them

them a distinct Office; being only a solemn be-
nediction and separation of them for the dis-
charge of that inspection committed to them;
and so we find *Paul* and *Barnabas* (though be-
fore that they preached the Gospel, yet when
they were sent on a particular Commission to
preach to the Gentiles) were blessed with im-
position of hands, *Acts* 13. 3. which was the
usual Ceremony of benediction. Therefore
you have no reason to quarrel this, unless you
apprehend their managing this oversight the
worse, that they are blessed in order to it: nor
can you quarrel the Office in the *Liturgy*, if you
do not think they will manage their power the
worse, if they receive a new effusion of the holy
Ghost. And thus you see, how little ground
there is, for quarrelling *Episcopacy* upon such
pretences.

Eud. I am truly glad you have said so much
for confirming me in my kindness for that *Go-
vernment*: for if you evince its lawfulness, I am
sure the expediency of that Constitution will
not be difficult to be proved, both for the tryal
of Entrants, and the oversight of these in Of-
fice: for when any thing lyes in the hands of a
multitude, we have ground enough to appre-
hend what the issue of it will prove. And what
sory overly things these tryals of Entrants are,
all know. How little pains is taken to form their
minds

minds into a right ſenſe of that function, to which they are to be initiated at one ſtep, without either previous degree, or mature tryal? And here I muſt ſay, the ruine of the Church ſprings hence, that the paſſage to ſacred Offices lyes ſo patent, whereby every one leaps into them out of a ſecular life, having all the train of his vanities, paſſions, and carnal deſigns about him: and moſt part entering thus unpurified, and unprepared, what is to be expected from them, but that they become idle, vain and licencious, or proud, ambitious, popular and covetous? I confeſs, things among us are not come to any ſuch ſettlement, as might give a proviſion againſt this: But deviſe me one like a *Biſhops authority*, who ſhal not confer Orders to any, before either himſelf, or ſome other ſelect and excellent perſons, on whom he may with confidence devolve that truſt, be well ſatisfied not only about the learning and abilities, but about the temper, the piety, the humility, the gravity, and diſcretion of ſuch as pretend to holy Orders: And that ſome longer tryal be taken of them by the *probationerſhip* of ſome previous degree. Indeed the poverty of the Church, which is not able to maintain Seminaries and Colledges of ſuch *Probationers*, renders this deſign almoſt impracticable. But ſtretch your thoughts as far as your invention can ſend them

them, and ſee if you can provide ſuch an expedient for the reforming of ſo viſible an abuſe, as were the Biſhops plenary authority to decide in this matter. For if it ly in the hands of a plurality, the major part of theſe, as of all mankind, being acted by lower meaſures, the conſiderations of kinred, alliance, friendſhip, or powerful recommendations, will always carry through perſons, be what they will, as to their abilities and other qualifications: And a multitude of Church-men is leſs concerned in the ſhame can follow an unworthy promotion; which every individual of ſuch a company will be ready to bear off himſelf, and faſten on the plurality. But if there were one to whom this were peculiarly committed, who had authority to ſtop it, till he were clearly convinced that the perſon to be ordained, was one from whoſe labors good might be expected to the Church, he could act more roundly in the matter: and it may be preſuppoſed that his condition ſetting him above theſe low conſiderations, to which the inferior Clergy are more obnoxious, he would manage it with more caution; as knowing that both before GOD and man, he muſt bear the blame of any unworthy promotion.

And as for theſe in Office, can any thing be more rational then that the inſpection into their labors, their deportment, their converſation, and their

and their dexterity in Preaching and Catechiſing, be not done mutually by themſelves in a parity, wherein it is to be imagined, that as they degenerat, they will be very gentle to one another? And when any inſpection is managed by an equal, it opens a door to faction, envy, and emulation: neither are the privat rebukes of an equal, ſo well received, nor will it be eaſie for one of a modeſt temper to admoniſh his fellow-Presbyter freely. And yet how many things are there, of which Church-men have need to be admoniſhed, in the diſcharge of all the parts of their function, eſpecially when they ſet out firſt, being often equally void of experience and diſcretion? But what a remedy for all this, may be expected from an excellent Biſhop: who ſhal either, if his health and ſtrength allow it, be making excurſions through his Dioceſs, and himſelf obſerve the temper, the labors, and converſation of his Clergy? or at leaſt truſt this to ſuch as he hath reaſon to confide moſt in, that ſo he may underſtand what admonitions, directions, and reproofs are to be given, which might obviat a great many indiſcretions, and ſcandals that flow from Church-men. And the authority of ſuch a perſon, as it would more recommend the reproofs to theſe for whom they were meant, ſo it could prevail to make them effectual, by a following cenſure if

neglected. If the confuſion ſome keep matters in; have hindered us for coming at a deſired ſettlement, the Office of Epiſcopacy is not to be blamed, whoſe native tendency I have laid out before you, not in a fair *idea*, but in what was both the rule and practiſe of the ancient Church, and wants not latter inſtances for verifying it. In a word, I muſt tell you, I am ſo far from apprehending danger to the Church, from Biſhops having too much power, that I ſhal fear rather its ſlow recovery, becauſe they have too little: which might be managed with all the meekneſs and humility imaginable, and indeed ought to be alwayes accompanied with the advice and concurrence of the worthieſt perſons among the inferior Clergy. But till you ſecure my fears of the greater part in all Societies becoming corrupt, I ſhal not ſay by the *major part* of them, but by the *better part*.

Iſot. I ſee you run a high ſtrain, and far different from what was the diſcourſe of this Countrey a year ago, of an accommodation was intended, wherein large offers ſeemed to be made: but I now ſee by your ingenuous freedom, that though for a while you (who were called a great friend to that deſign) were willing to yeeld up ſome parts of the Epiſcopal Grandeur, yet you retain the root of that Lordly ambition ſtill in your heart: and ſo though for

ſome

ſome particular ends, either to deceive, or divide the LORDS people, you were willing to make an appearance of yeelding; yet it was with a reſolution of returning with the firſt opportunity, to the old practiſes & deſigns of the Prelats, of enhanſing all Eccleſiaſtical Power to themſelves, and a few of their aſſociats. And this lets me ſee, what reaſon all honeſt people have to bleſs GOD that theſe arts and devices took not; *for an Ethiopian cannot change his skin.*

Phil. I confeſs to you freely, I was as little ſatisfied with theſe condeſcentions as any of you; and though they gave up the Rights of the Church to a peeviſh and perverſe party, whom gentleneſs will never gain: and therefore am no leſs ſatisfied then you are, that they did not take: and ſo much the more, that their refuſing to accept of ſo large offers, gave a new and clear character to the World of their temper: and that it is a faction, and the ſervile courting of a party which they deſign, and not a ſtrict adherence to the rules of conſcience, otherwiſe they had been more tractable.

Eud. Let me crave pardon to curb your humor a little, which ſeems too near a kin to *Iſotimus* his temper, though under a different character. For my part, I had then the ſame ſenſe of Epiſcopacy which I have juſt now owned. But when I conſidered the ruines of Re-

ligion, which our diviſions occaſioned among us, and when I read the large offers *S. Auguſtin* made on the like occaſion to the *Donatiſts*, I judged all poſſible attempts even with the largeſt condeſcentions for an accommodation, a worthy and pious deſign, well becoming the gravity and moderation of a Biſhop to offer, and the nobleneſs of theſe in authority to ſecond with their warmeſt endeavors: for if it was bleſſed with ſucceſs, the effect was great, even the ſetling of a broken and divided corner of the Church; if it took not, as it fully exonered the Church of the evils of the Schiſm; ſo it rendered the enemies of Peace and Unity the more unexcuſable. Only I muſt ſay this upon my knowledge, that whatever deſigns men of various ſentiments faſtened upon that attempt, it was managed with as much ingenuity and ſincerity, as mortals could carry along with them in any purpoſe. I know it is expected and deſired that a full account of all the ſteps of that affair be made publick, which a friend of ours drew up all along, with the progreſs of it. But at preſent my concern in one, whom a late Pamphlet, (as full of falſhoods in matters of fact, as of weakneſs in point of reaſon) hath miſrepreſented (*the caſe of Accommodation*, *Page* 31.) ſhal prevail with me to give an account of a particular paſſed in a Conference, which a Biſhop and

and two Presbyters had with about thirty of the Nonconformists, at *Pasley*, on the 14. *December*, in the year 1670. When the Bishop had in a long discourse recommended Unity and Peace to them, on the termes were offered; he withal said much to the advantage of Episcopacy as he stated it, from the rules and practises of the ancient Church: offering to turn their Proselyt immediatly, if they should give him either clear Scripture, good reason or warrant from the most Primitive Antiquity against such Episcopacy. And with other things, he desired to know whither they would have joyned in Communion with the Church, at the time of the Council of *Nice*, (to carry them no higher) or not? for if they refused that, he added he would have less heartiness to desire communion with them, since of these he might say, *Let my soul be with theirs.* But to that, a general answer was made by one, who said, He hoped they were not looked upon, as either so weak, or so wilful, as to determine in so great a matter, but upon good grounds: which were the same, that the asserters of Presbyterian Government had built on, which they judged to be conform both to Scripture and Primitive Antiquity. But for Scripture, neither he nor any of the meeting offered to bring a title: only he alledged some differences betwixt the ancient Presidents, as he

called them, and our Biſhops. But this was more fully enlarged by one who is believed to be among the moſt learned of the Party: whoſe words with the anſwer given them, I ſhal read to you, as I take both from a Journal was drawn of that affair, by one whoſe exactneſs and fidelity in it, can be atteſted by ſome worthy ſpectators, who read what he wrote after the Meeting was ended, and judged it not only faithful, but often verbal: And that he was ſo careful to evite the appearances of partiality, that he ſeemed rather ſtudious to be more copious in propoſing what was ſaid by theſe who differed from his opinion, whereas he contracted much of what was ſaid by theſe he favored. The account follows.

Mr. ------ *ſaid, That he offered to make appear, the difference was betwixt the preſent Epiſcopacy, and what was in the ancient Church, in five particulars. The firſt was, that they had no* Archbiſhops *in the Primitive Church. It is true, they had* Metropolitans; *but in a Council of* Carthage, *it was decreed, that no Biſhop ſhould be called* Summus Sacerdos, *or* Princeps Sacerdotum, ſed primæ ſedis Epiſcopus. 2. *The Biſhops in the ancient Church were Parochial, and not only* κατὰ πόλιν, *but in every Village* κατὰ κώμην; *for even in* Bethany *we find there was a Biſhop.* 3. *Two Biſhops might be in one Church, ſuch was (not to mention*

Alexan-

Alexander *and* Narciſſus *at* Jeruſalem) Auguſtin, *who with* Valerius, *was ordained Biſhop of* Hippo. 4. *Biſhops were elected by their Presbyters, ſo* Jerome *tells us, that in* Alexandria *the Presbyters chooſed one of their number to be Biſhop: and finally, the Biſhops were countable to and cenſurable by their Presbyters: for either this muſt have been, otherwiſe they could not have been cenſured at all. For though we meet with ſome Provincial Synods in Church Hiſtory, as that of* Carthage *in* Cyprians *time, for the rebaptizing of hereticks; and that at* Antioch *againſt* Samoſatenus, *yet theſe inſtances were rare, and recurred ſeldom; therefore there muſt have been a power in Presbyters to have cenſured their Biſhops, otherwiſe it could not have been done, which is abſurd to imagine. And upon all theſe accounts, he judged the preſent Epiſcopacy differed much from the ancient* προστασία.

Upon this diſcourſe, the Biſhop being weary of ſpeaking much, looked to one of his Presbyters, whom that Pamphlet in deriſion, calls, *a worthy Doctor*: who ſaid, *He found the ancient writings were ſo clear for a diſparity among Churchmen, and ſo full of it, that he was aſſured none could doubt it, after he had looked but overly upon them: But as to what was alledged, he firſt reſumed the five particulars, and ſpoke to them in order. To the firſt, he ſaid, It was true, the term* Archbiſhop, *was not uſed in the firſt Centuries: but in the Council of*

Nice, *mention is not only made of* Metropolitans; *but the Canon ſaith of them,* τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω, let the ancient cuſtoms have their force: *which ſhows the ſuperiority of* Metropolitans *to have been pretty early begun. And the Canon that was cited, calling him,* Primæ Sedis Epiſcopum, *makes him Primat: now we are not to contend about words, when the thing is clear: neither will any* Archbiſhop *judge himſelf injured, if inſtead of that name, he be called* Metropolitan, *or* Primat. *Beſides,* Archiepiſcopus, *doth not import* Prince of the Biſhops; *but that he is the chief and firſt of them. And this prefixing of* ἀρχι *to* ἐπίσκοπος, *was not ſo odious: for* Nazianzen *calls a Biſhop* ἀρχιερεὺς, *and the* Areopagite ἱεραρχὴς.

For the ſecond particular, it is true Biſhops were in many places very thick ſet; for in S. Auguſtins *time it appears from the journals of a Conference he had with the* Donatiſts, *that there were about five hundred Biſhopricks in a ſmal tract of ground, but this was not univerſal: for* Theodoret *tells he had* 800. *Paroiſſes in his Dioceſe: and* Sozomen *tells of great Countreys where there were very few Biſhops. And to prove this, the Canons of* Ancyra *make a difference betwixt the Presbyters of the Countrey from thoſe of the City: and over the former there was a* Chorepiſcopus; *which ſhows that the whole Dioceſe was not within the City. But this was not much to our purpoſe, ſince the* more or the leſs did not vary

vary the kind. *And if a Biſhop might be over the Miniſters of the City, it cannot be unlawful that he be likewiſe ſet over more in the Countrey: which can be no more eſſential to this matter, then it is, whither a Pariſh be great or ſmal. So that this difference may well make the one unexpedient, but unlawful it cannot be, if the other be lawful.*

For the third particular, there was a Canon of the Council of Nice, *that there might be* but one Biſhop in a City. *And he was amazed to hear the inſtance of* S. Auguſtin *alledged, who was indeed ordained Coadjutor to* Valerius; *but himſelf in his* 110. Epiſt. *condemns that, telling that he did it ignorantly, not knowing it to be contrary to the* Nicen Rules: *And therefore he tells how he deſigned* Eradius *to be his ſucceſſor, but would not ordain him in his own time, becauſe of that Canon. Other inſtances of more Biſhops in one City, might have been more pertinently adduced to this purpoſe: but they were either Coadjutors, ſuch as* Nazianzen *the ſon was to his father; or it was agreed to for ſetling a Schiſm, as was done in the Schiſm betwixt* Meletius *and* Paulinus *of* Antioch. *And ſo* S. Auguſtin *and the* African *Biſhops with him, offered to the* Donatiſts, *that would they agree with them theſe ſchiſmatical Biſhops ſhould be continued as conjunct Biſhops with thoſe already ſetled in thoſe Sees were they lived. It is true, ſome will have both* Linus *and* Clemens *to have ſucceeded* S. Peter *at* Rome, *and* Evodius *and* Ignatius *to*

have

have ſucceeded him at Antioch: *But for this, none aſſert that both ſucceeded to* S. Peter; *ſome being for one, and ſome for another: and ſo in a hiſtorical matter, the teſtimonies of theſe who lived neareſt that time ſhould decide the queſtion. But the* Conſtitutions *of* Clemens *offer a ſolution to this, that at firſt there were in ſome Cities two Churches, one for thoſe of the* Circumciſion, *and another for thoſe of the* Uncircumciſion: *and after the deſtruction of* Jeruſalem, *this diſtinction was ſwallowed up. This is rational, and not without ground in Scripture: beſides, that that Book, though none of* Clements, *yet is ancient. And from all this it was clear, that there might be but one Biſhop in a City.*

As for the fourth particular, it is true, the ancient elections of Biſhops *and* Presbyters *were partly by* Synods, *partly by* Presbyters, *and partly popular. But as none would ſay it made any eſſential alteration of the* Conſtitution *of a Church, if in ſtead of theſe elections,* Patrons *had now a right of preſenting to Churches; ſo though in ſtead of theſe elections the King were* Patron *of all the Biſhopricks, it did not alter the nature of* Epiſcopacy, *much leſs juſtifie a Schiſm againſt it. But beſide this, it was known the Capitular elections were ſtill continued.*

And for the fifth particular, he deſired they might give one inſtance in all Antiquity, where a Biſhop was cenſured by Presbyters: it being clear that they could finiſh nothing without the Biſhops ſentence, μηδὲν

ἐπιτε-

σιτελείτωσαν ἄνευ γνώμης ἐπισκόπου, *was the words of the Canon: And if they could finish nothing without the Bishop, much less could they censure himself.* Provincial Synods *were begun in the second* Centu-ry, *which appears from many* Synods *were held about the day of observing* Easter. *Another expedient they had, when a Bishop was heretical, that the neighbouring Bishops used to publish it in their* Cicular Let-ters, *which went a round, and so they did excommunicat or depose them. But the regular way of procedure against Bishops was in* Provincial Synods, *which were now offered to be set up. Yet even this exception could be no ground for separating, no more then in their principles Lay Elders had to separat from their Ministers, who were their fixed President, and yet did not judge themselves censurable by these Lay Elders; though as to the power of ruling, they held them to be equal.* With this he ended, saying, *He had now proposed what occurred of a sudden to his thoughts on these heads, though he believed much more might be adduced; but he supposed there was enough said to clear these particulars.* And it seems the person who had engaged him to this, judged so; since neither he, nor any of his brethren, offered a reply. And by this account (of the truth whereof I am willing all there present bear witness) let the company judge of the ingenuity of these Writers. But I shal pursue the discourse of the accommodation no further.

Basil.

Baſil. I am ſure it hath left this conviction on all our conſciences, that that Party is obſtinatly fixed to their own humors, without the leaſt color of reaſon. But now, I think, enough is ſaid for juſtifying both the lawfulneſs and uſefulneſs of Epiſcopacy, and that there is nothing in it contrary either to the nature or rules of the Goſpel, or of right reaſon. And for any occaſional evils may have riſen from the reſtitution of this Government, they are with no juſtice to be faſtened on it. I know, many accuſe their revenues and honors, thus *the ſpirit that is in us luſteth to envy:* and the eyes of many are evil becauſe the eyes of our pious Progenitors were good. But indeed the ravenous appetits of ſome *Oſtriches* among us, have ſwallowed down ſo much of the Churches Patrimony, that what remains of it, can ſcarce provoke envy. And truly Church-men beſtowing their revenues well, for almes-deeds, relieving the widow and orphans, and ſuch modeſt hoſpitality and decency, as may preſerve them from the diſeſteem of the vulgar, who meaſure their value of men much from theſe externals, there were no ground of quarrelling at them were their riches ſeven fold encreaſed. I am far from the thought of patroniſing the *German* Biſhops, on whom I look as the diſgrace of that Order, who live in all things like other Princes, making wars, and leadin

eading out armies: nor do they once conſider heir Dioceſes, or what they owe them as Biops, being wholly immerſed in ſecular affairs. But for all this, I cannot ſee cauſe for blaming Church-men, their being either upon the pubick Counſels of the Kingdom in Parliaments, r on his Majeſties Secret Counſels, and that oth becauſe Eccleſiaſtical matters are often in gitation, both in the one, and the other, in hich none are ſo properly to be adviſed with s Church-men. Occaſion may alſo be frequently given to thoſe who ſhould be preſuppoſed to underſtand the rules of equity and conience beſt, to lay them before others, who either know them not, or mind them too little. nd finally, they are ſubjects, as well as others, nd by the clearneſs is to be expected in their udgements, and the calmneſs of their minds, ogether with their abſtracted and contemplave manner of life, they may upon occaſions be ery prudent Counſellors: And why a Prince al be deprived of the Counſels of that which ould be the wiſeſt and beſt part of his Kingom, no reaſon can be given. But for all this, acknowledge there is great hazard from huane infirmity, leſt by ſuch medling they be o much intangled in matters extrinſick to em, whereby their thoughts may be drawn out om that inward, ſerene, & abſtracted temper

where-

wherein their minds ſhould be preſerved; bot
for more ſpiritual contemplation, and for
more cloſe purſuing the work of the Goſpe
which ought ſtill to be their chief labor. But
muſt touch this ſtring no more, leſt you ſay tha
the Fox preacheth, and me thinks our diſcourſe
now near its period.

Iſot. A great many things do yet remai
which are untouched, and deſerve to be bette
conſidered: for theſe crude Dialogues powre
out a great deal of ſtuff, which it is like the wri
ter never examined: And in theſe, you who ar
his friends, muſt either vindicat him, or leav
him to the mercy of every ſevere cenſurer.

Eud. His temper is well enough known t
us, that he is very little ſollicitous about th
eſteem or cenſures of men: and therefore, if a
the particulars in his Book, cannot maintai
themſelves to the judgements of rational an
unprepoſſeſſed Readers, he thinks them no
worthy of his Patrociny. And for that litt
trifling way of writing, by tracing every wor
in a Book, or of making good all a man hat
ſaid, it is a task equally mean, unpleaſan
and laborious: and looks like one contendin
for victory more then truth. Were it a worth
thing for us to go and reckon how often *an*
comes about in any of that Pamphleters lon
periods, or how often he writes falſe Gramma

hou

ow harſh his phraſes, and how tedious his pe-
iods are? or make other ſuch like remarks,
lace, did we that, there were no end! and
et ſuch like are many of his reflections. But
hen how beautiful were our diſcourſe, if inter-
oven with thoſe elegancies of *poor wretch*, *bab-*
er, *impertinent*, *conſident*, *ignorant*, *atheiſt*, *ſcoffer*,
nd many more of that ſame ſtrain? I know well
nough why he uſed thoſe, his deſign being to
ake his gentle and ſimple Readers ſtand grave-
y, and turn up the white, and look pale, and
ffrighted with all thoſe black imputations he
harges on that *poor wretch*. Me thinks I hear
he cenſures of the herd, when they firſt read
ver his Book, to this purpoſe: *Oh, here is a wor-*
hy piece, full of deep learning; and believe me, he
peaks home: he is a ſweet man that wrote it, be who
e will, and was marvellouſly born through in it all.
And oh, but it is ſeaſonable! and well timed: for
e hath anſwered the whole Book to a word. And
here we thought it ſtrongeſt, he ſhows its weakneſs
moſt. But I wiſh the poor wretch repentance, yet it
s a proud companion, and full of diſdain; but I
ope he is humbled for once: it were a pity of him, for
hey ſay he hath ſome abilities: but they are all wrong
et: and he will, may be, ſtudy to heal the beaſt of the
round, which one of our Champions hath given it;
ut had he any ſparks of grace, I could yet love him
or his good ——— ſake.

It

It were a worthy attempt to go and ſatisfie ſuch a gang of cattel: therefore the cavils on the fifth and ſixth Dialogue are ſo poor, that it were loſt time to conſider them; and ſo groundleſs, that he who from reading over the Dialogues themſelves, is not able to withſtand all thoſe tricks of Sophiſtry, would be little bettered by all we could add: and therefore we may well quite the Theam, and that the rather, that we have examined all that is of publick concern in theſe debates: and for any thing that was ſtarted, which lyes out of the way, we will leave the diſcuſſing of theſe to the Conformiſt himſelf; ſince our deſign in this Conference was to get mutual ſatisfaction to our conſciences, in theſe things which the Laws enjoyn: and if we have gained this, we are to leave contending about other things, which relate not to us. Only if in theſe greater points it be found that what the Conformiſt ſaid in the Dialogues, was grounded on ſo much clear and ſtrong reaſon, as we have diſcovered ſince our firſt meeting; it is to be preſumed that in other things he was not ſo raſh or irrational as to utter ſuch abſurdities or errors, as the late Pamphlets do charge upon him.

Phil. Our work was to conſider, whither abſolut ſubjection was due to the Civil Authority and how far its dominion over our obedienc

did reach, and whither the principles and practiſes of the late times, had ſuch evident characters of GODS acceptance on them, that it was an unpardonable crime to reverſe that building, which they prepared with ſo much noiſe, and cemented with ſo much blood; and by conſequence whither Epiſcopacy was *that accurſed thing* which provoked GODS jealouſie ſo much againſt us, that it was unlawful to unite with it, or ſo far to comply with its adherents as to unite with them in worſhip? If theſe things be made clear to us, we need not amuſe our ſelves, nor intertain one another with further janglings, and therefore may break off our Conference.

Iſot. Since you will break off, I ſhal not ſtruggle about it: for it is a confeſſion of your weakneſs, that you paſs over ſo many things with this ſlight ſilence.

Baſil. This is the genuine ſpirit of the party which you now expreſs to the life; but whenever the Author of the Dialogues undergoes the pennance of examining what you deſire, it will perhaps appear, you have as little ground for this as for your other boaſtings. But I am ſure no ſcruple ſticks with me about theſe great heads we have examined, ſo that upon a narrow ſurvey of theſe matters, it appears he had more reaſon for what he aſſerted, then he then vented:

And I have as little doubt of his being able to clear himſelf about other matters, which are ſnarled at by theſe Pamphlets. But one thing I have not forgot, about which I am more ſollicitous: which was a promiſe *Polyhiſtor* made of ſending when our Conference were ended, an account of the model and forms of the ancient Government: which I deſire with ſuch earneſtneſs, that I wiſh we were gone, that he might be as good as his word.

Poly. I know not if it ſhal anſwer your hopes, but your curioſity ſhal be quickly ſatisfied, after I have given you ſome account of my deſign in it. When I conſidered the ruines of Religion, and the decayes of Piety through the World, I have often bent my thoughts to ſeek out the moſt proper remedies and means for the Churches recovery: and that which ſeemed the moſt promiſing, was to conſider the conſtitution, the rites and forms of the Church in her firſt and pureſt ages; and to obſerve the ſteps of their declining from the primitive ſimplicity and purity, which being once fully done, great materials would be thereby congeſted for many uſeful thoughts, and overtures in order to a Reformation. And this is a work, which for all the accurat enquiries this age hath produced, is not yet performed to any degree of perfection or ingenuity: therefore I reſolved to purſu

thi

this deſign as much as my leaſure and other avocations could allow of. But as I was doubtful what method to follow in digeſting my obſervations, the Canons vulgarly called Apoſtolical, offered themſelves to my thoughts: I thereupon reſolved to follow their tract, and to compile ſuch hints as I could gather on my way for giving a clear view of the ſtate of the Church in the firſt ages. As for the opinions of the ancient Fathers, theſe have been ſo copiouſly examined by the Writers of Controverſies, that ſcarce any thing can be added to thoſe who went before us: but few have been at ſuch pains for ſearching into their practiſes, and rules for Diſcipline, and Worſhip, wherein their excellency and ſtrength lay. In this inquiry I have now made good advances, but at preſent I will only ſend you my Obſervations on the two firſt Canons: and as you ſhal find this task hath ſucceeded with me, I will be encouraged to break it off, or to purſue it further. Only on the way, let me tell you, that I am ſo far from thinking theſe Canons, Apoſtolical, that nothing can be more evident, then that they were a collection made in the third *Century* at ſooneſt: for the matter of almoſt every Canon diſcovers this when well examined, and therefore that Epiſtle of *Zephirinus* the Pope, who lived about the year 200. that mentions 60. (or as others cite

it 70.) of the Apoſtles ſayings, is not to be conſidered: that Epiſtle with the other *Decretals*, being ſo manifeſtly ſpurious, that it cannot be doubted by any who reads them: and the number 60. agrees with no Edition; for they are either 50. or 85. *Tertullian* is alſo cited for them, but the words cited as his, are not in his Book *contra Praxeam*, from which they are vouched. Nor can they be called the work of *Clemens Romanus*, though they were vented under his name. For *Athanaſius* in his *Synopſis*, reckons the work of *Clemens Apocryphal*. And *Euſebius* tells us that nothing aſcribed to *Clement* was held genuine, but his Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*. But the firſt Publiſhers of theſe who, lived, it is like in the third *Century*, have called them Apoſtolical, as containing the earlieſt rules which the Apoſtolical men had introduced in the Church. And afterwards others to conciliat more veneration for them, called them the Canons of the Apoſtles, compiled by *Clement*. And this drew *Pope Gelaſius* his cenſure on them, by which the Book of the Canons of the Apoſtles is declared Apocryphal: which ſome who aſſert their authority and Antiquity, would fooliſhly evite, by applying that cenſure only to the 35. added Canons: whereas the cenſure is ſimply paſſed on the Book, and not on any additions to it. And this ſhal ſerve for an Introduction to the

papers

papers I will ſend you how ſoon I get home.

Phil. I doubt not but all of us, except *Iſotimus*, will be very deſirous to underſtand the particular forms of the Primitive Church: but he is ſo ſure, that they will conclude againſt him, that I believe he is not very curious of any ſuch diſcovery.

Iſot. You are miſtaken, for I doubt not, but much will be found among the Ancients for me; but if otherwiſe, I will lead you a ſtep higher, to let you ſee that from the beginning it was not ſo: For Antiquity when againſt Scripture, proves only the error ancient. And if you quite the Scriptures to us, we will yeeld thoſe muſty records to you.

Eud. Pray, ſpeak not ſo confidently, after all your pretences have been ſo baffled, that we are aſhamed of you: for you are like the *Spaniard*, who retained his ſupercilious looks and gate, when he was ſet to beg. But I will not be rude in a place which owns me for its Maſter, though really your confidence extorts it.

Iſot. You are a proud company, and ſo elevated in your own eyes, that you deſpiſe all who differ from you, and think you cenſure them gently, if you call them no worſe then ignorants and fools. Is there any arrogance in the world like this?

Phil. Pray, let us not fall out, now that we

are to part: but I confeſs it is no wonder the ſmart of all the foils you have got, provoke ſome paſſion in you, & ſo I pitty you; for I know none of your party who would have carried ſo diſcreetly. Therefore, Adieu, I muſt be gone, and leave this good company.

Iſot. You will have the laſt word of ſcolding, but I perhaps will find out one that will be too hard for you all, and will call you to account of all you have both argued and boaſted.

Baſil. I will break off next, ſince the deſign of your meeting is finiſhed: only, *Polyhiſtor*, mind your promiſe.

Poly. I go about it, and therefore, *Eudaimon*, I beg your pardon to be gone.

Eud. Though retirement and ſolitude be ever acceptable to me, yet it will not be without ſome pain that I return to it, when I miſs ſo much good company, as have relieved me theſe four dayes: but the truth is, on the other hand, I am glad to ſee an end put to this painful Engagement of which I ſuppoſe we are all weary. It remains only that I return you my ſincere and hearty thanks for the favor you have done me, which I wiſh I could do ſo warmly, as might engage you frequently to oblige me with the like civilities. Adieu, my good friends.

F I N I S.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE FIRST AND SECOND OF THE CANONS,

Commonly aſcribed to the holy Apoſtles.

Wherein an account of the Primitive Conſtitution and Government of Churches, is contained.

Drawn from ancient and acknowledged Writings.



GLASGOW,
By ROBERT SANDERS, Printer to the City, and Univerſity, 1673.

THE FIRST CANON.

Επίσκοπος χειροτονείσθω ὑπὸ επισκόπων δύο ἢ τριῶν.

A Biſhop ſhal be ordained by two or three Biſhops.

A BISHOP.

THIS word is ſometime taken for a *Spy*, ſo *Euſtathius ad Homeri* K. ſometime for a *defender*; ſo *Hector* was called *Biſhop* of *Troy* by *Homer*, *Iliad* ω. There was among the *Athenians* a publick office ſo called: and in this ſenſe, it was alſo uſed among the *Romans*; ſo *Cicero ad Atticum, lib. 7. epiſt.* 11. tells, That *Pompey* would had him to be, *quem tota campania & maritima ora habeant Epiſcopum, ad quem delectus & ſumma negotij referatur, ff. de mun. & hon. leg. ult. parag. item Epiſcopi ſunt, qui præſunt pani & cæteris rebus vænalibus.*

This

This term is ſometime in the Old Teſtament. And *Clemens Romanus epiſt. ad Rom.* proves Biſhop and Deacon to be no new terms, from *Iſai.* 60. 17. Καταστήσω ἐπισκόπους αὐτων ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, καὶ τὺς διακόνους αὐτῶν ἐν πίστει. But in our edition, we find: Δώσω τὺς ἄρχοντάς σε ἐν εἰρήνῃ, καὶ τὺς ἐπισκόπους σε ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ (where, on the way, mark how different the preſent edition of the *Septuagint* is, from that which *Clemens* made uſe of) ἐπισκοπὴ, is alſo *Pſal.* 109. 8. Among the *Jews*, he who was the chief of the Synagogue, was called *Chazan hakeneſeth*, the Biſhop of the Congregation; and *Sheliach tſibbor*, the Angel of the Church. And the Chriſtian Church being modelled as near the form of the Synagogue as could be, as they retained many of the Rites, ſo the form of their government was continued, and the names remained the ſame. But more of this afterward.

Clemens Romanus in his *Epiſtle*, ſpeaks only of Biſhops and Deacons. *Polycarp* again in his *Epiſtle*, ſpeaks only of Presbyters and Deacons; where ſome objects that it would ſeem, that both in the Church of *Corinth*, to which *Clement* wrote and in that of *Philippi*, to which *Polycarp* wrote there were but two Orders of Church-men whom the one calls Biſhops, the other Presbyters. But if *Polycarps Epiſtle* be genuine, the theſe of *Ignatius*, which he there mentions, mu

b

e ſo too, and in them the matter is paſt con-
oyerſie.

Epiphanius lib. 3. hær. 75. tells, that at firſt
here were only Biſhops and Deacons, which
e ſaith he had ἐκ βαθυτάτης ἱστορίας; and that
bi Epiſcopi erant jam conſtituti, ſcripſit Epiſcopis &
Diaconis. Non enim omnia ſtatim potuerunt Apo-
oli conſtituere. Presbyteris enim opus eſt & Dia-
nis, per hos enim duos Eccleſiaſtica compleri poſ-
nt; ubi vero, non inventus eſt quis dignus Epiſco-
atu, permanſit locus ſine Epiſcopo. Ubi autem
pus fuit, & erant digni Epiſcopatu, conſtituti ſunt
piſcopi; cum autem multitudo non eſſet, non inventi
nt inter ipſos, qui Presbyteri conſtituerentur, &
ntenti erant ſolo Epiſcopo *in loco conſtituto. Ve-*
um ſine Diacono impoſſibile eſt eſſe Epiſcopum. So
ſeems, that from theſe profound Hiſtories
hich he had read, it appeared, that in ſome Vil-
ages there were only Presbyters, and no Bi-
hops, becauſe in thoſe places none were found
orthy of it. But certainly theſe places were
bliged to depend upon ſome place where there
as a Biſhop conſtitut: For if none were wor-
hy to be Biſhops, much leſs were they worthy
o conſtitut a Church within themſelves, and in-
dependent. It alſo appears, that in ſome pla-
es at firſt, they had no Presbyters: And indeed
here the number of Chriſtians was ſo ſmal (as
o doubt it was in many places at firſt) a Biſhop
alone

alone might well have ſerved a whole City But where the Chriſtians were more numerous there were need of more hands, to aſſiſt the Biſhop in his work.

As for that of *Polycarps* naming no Biſhop but only Presbyters and Deacons, perhaps he wrote in the vacancy of the See: ſo we find many Letters of *Cyprians ad Clerum Romanum* when there was no Biſhop. Beſides, it is known that at firſt the names of Biſhop and Presbyter were uſed promiſcuouſly.

Presbyters were ſo called, not from their age as they were men, but from the age of their Chriſtianity: For a Neophite was not to be ordained, and the Presbyters did joyntly with the Biſhop, both rule and feed the flock. But ſome do ſtretch this too far, as if always the eldeſt Presbyter had been choſen Biſhop.

The *Commentaries* upon the *Epiſtles*, commonly called *Ambroſes*, but truly *Hilarie*, the Deacons (of which I ſhal ſay nothing, it being now agreed among the Criticks, that they are his) upon the 4. of the *Eph.* After he hath at length ſhown the difference which was betwixt the Churches in the Apoſtles times, when they were not fully conſtitut, and the ages that ſucceeded, he tells how at firſt all in the Clergie baptized and preached, and that on any day or where they had opportunity. But afterward

Deacon

Deacons were reſtrained in this, and things were aſtricted to certain times and places. *Hinc eſt ergo* (ſaith he) *unde nunc neque Diaconi in popu-lo prædicant, nec Clerici, nec Laici baptizant.* ---- *Ideo, non per omnia conveniunt ſcripta Apoſtolica ordinationi, quæ nunc in Eccleſiâ eſt, quia hæc inter ipſa primordia ſunt ſcripta. Nàm & Timotheum à se creatum Presbyterum, Epiſcopum nominat, quia apud veteres Presbyteri, Epiſcopi appellabantur, ut recedente eo, ſequens ei ſuccederet. Denique apud Ægyptum Presbyteri conſignant, ſi præſens non ſit Epiſcopus: ſed quia cœperunt preſentes Epiſcopi indigni inveniri, ad primatus tenendos immutata eſt ratio, proſpiciente Concilio, ut non ordo, ſed meritum crearet Epiſcopum. Multorum Sacerdotum judicio conſtitutum, ne indignus temere uſurparet, & eſſet multis ſcandalo.* And like to this is, what he ſaith on 1. *Tim.* 3. from which words, it would appear, that he thought the *Elder Presbyter*, without any Election or Ordination, ſucceeded unto the chair of the deceaſed Biſhop. But this is directly contrary even to what *Jerome* himſelf ſaith: neither do we find any ſuch conſtitution as that he mentions, either in the Acts of the Council of *Nice*, or of any other.

It is true, *Clemens Romanus* ſaith, That the Apoſtles ordained their firſt fruits, τας ἀπαρχας, to be the Biſhops and Deacons of them who ſhould afterward believe: but he adds δοκιμα-

ζόντες

ζόντες τῷ πνεύματι, trying them by the ſpiri
(that of diſcerning ſpirits being among thei
extraordinary gifts) and though they ordained
no Neophyte, yet there is no reaſon to believe,
that either they made the eldeſt Chriſtians
Presbyters, or the eldeſt Presbyters, Biſhops.
The choice of *Matthias*, and of the *ſeve*
Deacons, ſhews that it went not ſimplie by age
S. James the younger was Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, &
Timothy was but young, when ordained. Yet th
difference of *Biſhop* and *Presbyter* ſeems not t
have been unknown to *Clemens*, as appears fro
theſe ſayings of his, ὑποτασσόμενοι τοῖς ἡγουμένο
ὑμῶν, καὶ τιμὴν τὴν καθήκουσαν ἀπονέμοντες τοῖς π
ὑμῖν πρεσβυτέροις *præpoſitis veſtris ſubditi & ſeni*
res inter vos debito honore proſequentes. ----- τοὺς πρ
γουμένους ἡμῶν αἰδεσθῶμεν, τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους ἡμῶν τ
μήσωμεν. *Qui nobis præſunt revereamur, ſenior*
inter nos honoremus, τῷ γὰρ ἀρχιερεῖ ἰδίαι λειτου
γίαι δεδομέναι εἰσὶ, καὶ τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν ἴδιος ὁ τόπ
προστέταχται. καὶ λευίταις ἰδίαι διακονίαι ἐπίκει
ται. ὁ λαϊκὸς ἄνθρωπος τοῖς λαϊκοῖς προστάγμασιν δ
δεται. Which by the words that follow, mu
certainly relate to ſome Eccleſiaſtical conſtitu
tion among themſelves, to which he accom
modats the terms of the Temple Hierarchi
All which I propoſe without any peremptor
deciſion in this matter, ſubmitting it to th
judgement of the impartial Reader: for I kno
the

here are exceptions againſt theſe words, yet hey do clearly imply a difference and ſubordiation betwixt the *Presbyters*, and their *Preſi*ents: and what he ſaith of the ranks of the *High Prieſt, the Prieſts, the Levites, and the Laicks*, ath certainly a relation to the Orders of the hurch.

The next opinion about the origine, of Epiſopacie, is that of *Jerome*, and he hath given it ery fully, both in his epiſtle to *Evagrius*, and n the *Epiſt.* to *Titus*, *cap.* He holds, that all hings at firſt were governed in the Church, *ommuni Presbyterorum conſilio*, and that the Biſhops were above the Presbyters, *non ex diſpoſione dominicâ, ſed ex Eccleſiæ conſuetudine*; And y divers arguments from Scripture, he proves, hat Biſhop and Presbyter are one and the ſame. *Acts* 20. they who *v.* 17. are called *Presbyters*, re *v.* 28. called *Biſhops*. *Titus* 1. 5. *he left him o ordain Elders*, and *v.* 7. it is added, *For a Biſhop*, *&c.* Whence he inferrs, that Biſhop and Preſyter are one and the ſame. As alſo *Phil.* 1. the poſtle writes only to Biſhops and Deacons. nd 1 *Tim.* 3. he gives the rules only to Biſhops nd Deacons. *S. Peter* alſo called himſelf Συμπρεσβύτερος: And *S. John* deſigns himſelf the lder.

But he adds, after there aroſe Schiſms, and ne ſaid, I am of *Paul*, &c. *Toto orbe decretum*

eſt

eſt, ut unus cæteris ſuper imponeretur ad quem omnis Eccleſiæ cura pertineret, & Schiſmatum ſemina tollerentur ---- ut Schiſmatum plantaria evellerentur ad unum, omnis ſollicitudo eſt delata. And *ad Evagrium*, he tells how *Alexandriæ à Marco Evangeliſtâ uſque ad Heraclam & Dionyſium, Presbyteri ſemper unum ex ſe electum, in excelſiori gradu collocatum Epiſcopum nominabant. ---- Quid enim excepta ordinatione facit Epiſcopus, quod Presbyter non facit. ---- Et, ut ſciamus traditiones Apoſtolicas ſumptas de Veteri Teſtamento; quod Aaron, & filij ejus atque Levitæ, fuerunt in Templo, hoc ſibi & Epiſcopi, & Presbyteri, & Diaconi vendicent in Eccleſia.* And from theſe words we may obſerve, that he accounted the difference of Biſhop and Presbyter, an Apoſtolical tradition, which came in place of the difference that was betwixt, *Aaron* and his ſons: as alſo, that this began from the time of the Apoſtles, and of *Mark* the Evangeliſt: That it was done to evite Schiſm, and that it was appointed through the whole world: as alſo, that the whole care and chief Power was in the hands of the Biſhop, of which he ſaith further, *Dial adv. Luciferianos. Eccleſiæ ſalus in ſummi Sacerdotis dignitate pendet, cui ſi non exors quædam, & ab omnibus eminens detur poteſtas, tot in Eccleſiâ efficientur Schiſmata, quot Sacerdotes.* It may ſeem likewiſe probable, from him, that Presbyters chooſed their Biſhop out of their own

own number, and that in *Alexandria* they made him Biſhop without any new Ordination. And of this *Eutychius Patriarcha Alex.* who was not very long after *Jerome*, ſpeaks more plainly, for he in his *Origines Eccleſiæ Alexandrinæ*, publiſhed by *Selden*, *Pag.* 29. 30. tells that there were twelve Presbyters conſtitut by *S. Mark*, and when the See was vacant, they did chooſe one of their number to ſucceed, and to be their Head, and the reſt laid their hands upon him, and bleſt him; yet this cannot hold true, as ſhal afterwards appear.

But all *Ignatius* his *Epiſtles*, are full of the ſubordination of Presbyters to Biſhops, not without verie hyperbolical magnifications of the Biſhops Office. It is true, in the *vulgar editions* theſe expreſſions are much more frequent; but in the *Mediçean Codex* (publiſhed by *Voſſius*, which agrees not only with the old *Latine* one publiſhed by *Uſher*, but alſo with the citations of *Theodoret*, & *Athanaſius*, & other ancient Writers which they have taken out of them) there is a great deal of the ſubordination of Presbyters to Biſhops. *Ep. ad Tral*: he ſaith, *Neceſſarium eſt, quemadmodum facitis ſine Epiſcopo nihil operari. Omnes revereantur* Epiſcopum *ut Jeſum Chriſtum exiſtentem filium Patris, Presbyteros autem, ut conſilium Dei, & conjunctionem Apoſtolorum.* To the *Epheſ.* he bids them be ſubject τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, καὶ

καὶ πρεσβυτερίῳ, and concludes that they ſhould obey theſe ἀπερισπάστῳ διανοίᾳ. In his *epiſt.* to the *Magneſians*, he ſaith, *Quidam* Epiſcopum *quidem vocant, ſine ipſo autem omnia operantur:* wherefore he adviſeth them, *ut omnia operentur præſidente* Epiſcopo *in loco Dei, & Presbyteris in loco confeſſionis Apoſtolorum.* And there he ſpeaks of the age of *Damas* their Biſhop, who was but a young man, which he calls according to the vulgat Edition, τὴν φαινομένην νεότητα, but in the Medicean Codex τὴν φαινομένην νεωτερικὴν τάξιν from which ſome will infer, that Epiſcopacy was then newly invented, but ſuppoſe that were the true reading, which ſome queſtion, who in this prefer the vulgar reading, it is clear from the whole Epiſtle that he is ſpeaking of the Biſhops age, & not of Epiſcopacy. And from 2. *Tim.* 2. 22. we ſee νεωτερικὴ is properly youthful, and καινὴ is that which is new. And what though *Ignatius*, who lived ſo near the Apoſtles time did call Epiſcopacy a new Order? Many other places to the ſame purpoſe of the difference among theſe Offices occur through all his Epiſtles, neither is there any room for debate: but if theſe Epiſtles be his, the difference of Biſhop and Presbyter hath begun in the Apoſtolick times. But that debate would prove too long a digreſſion here; therefore I refer the Reader, if he deſire a full diſcuſſion of that queſtion to t

incomparably learned and exact defence of hem, lately publiſhed by *Doctor Pearſon*, whoſe harveſt is ſo full, that he hath not ſo much as left work for a gleaner.

That of the *Angel* in the *Revelation*, is brought by many, and that not without ground, o prove that there was ſome ſingular perſon in heſe Churches to whom each Epiſtle was dire-ted, and we have a great deal of reaſon to be-ieve that *Polycarp* was then Biſhop of the Church of *Smyrna*. *Iren. lib.* 3. *cap.* 3. and *apud Euſeb. lib.* 4. *cap.* 13. tells that *Polycarp* was ὑπὸ ἀποστόλων ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν Σμύρνᾳ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος καθισταθεὶς. Now *Ireneus* tells how he was *Po-ycarp* his hearer and diſciple, and had converſed with him in his youth, and had often heard him each. And as it were great uncharitableneſs to uſpect the truth of his narration in a matter of act, ſo we cannot think he could have been mi-taken in a matter of that importance. But what-ver jealouſie may fix upon *Ireneus*, there is no hadow of ground, for ſuſpecting either the ve-acity, or good information of the Church of *myrna*, who (giving an account of his Martyr-om in an epiſtle inſert by *Euſeb.* in his hiſtory, *b.* 4. *cap.* 13.) call him Biſhop of the Catholick Church of *Smyrna*.

All that can be alledged againſt this, is, that n their ſtile Biſhop and Presbyter were one and

the ſame thing. But the contrary of this is clear from *Ireneus*, who ſpeaks always of Biſhops as diſtinct from Presbyters: and though he ſometime call Biſhops, Presbyters, yet he never calls Presbyters, Biſhops; which is alſo the ſtile of theſe few Writers of that age, who ſometimes call *Biſhops*, *Presbyters*. *Euſebius* tells from the teſtimony of the Church of *Lions* how he was firſt a Presbyter in *Lions* under *Pothinus*: after whoſe Martyrdom he ſucceeded him in the Chair, and dyed Biſhop there. And if we will hear himſelf, *lib.* 3. *cap.* 3. when he is reckoning up the tradition of the faith from the Apoſtles, he deduceth it by all the Biſhops who did ſit in *Rome* from the Apoſtolick times; whence two things will follow; one, that he judged there had been ſtill Biſhops in the Church. The other, that he looked on the Biſhop, as the chief depoſitary of the faith.

Further, *Euſeb. lib.* 5. *cap.* 24. ſets down his Epiſtle to *Victor* Biſhop of *Rome*, wherein he chides him for excommunicating the *Eaſtern* Biſhops; and there he lays the whole blame upon *Victor*, without ſharing it among the Presbyters; and alſo commends the former Biſhops of *Rome* for their greater gentleneſs; whereby it plainly appears, that he judged that the power of diſcipline lay chiefly in the Biſhops hands. *Policrates* alſo (*apud Euſeb. lib.* 5. *hiſt. cap.* 23. vind

indicats the practiſe of their Church about the ay of *Eaſter, not only from the example of the Apo-les among them, but of the ſeven Biſhops who precee-ed him in his See.* From which we may not nly infer, that there was but one Biſhop in a ity, from the days of the Apoſtles; but that his uthority was great, ſince what they did, paſſed or a precedent to their ſucceſſors. And in-eed the difference of Biſhop and Presbyter, s ſo expreſs in *Ireneus*, that the moſt learned aſ-ertors of parity, confeſs the change was begun efore his time, which was in the end of the ſe-ond *Century*. Now how this change could ave been introduced, when there was neither ounſel, nor ſecular Prince to eſtabliſh it, when hurch-men were ſo pure. (*Polycarp* an Apoſto-ical man, having died but about thirty years efore; beſides many other Apoſtolical men ho had long ſurvived) when the Church was n the fire of perſecution, and ſo leſs droſs could e among them; when there was no ſecular in-ereſt to bait them to it: for on the contrary his ſubjected them to the firſt fury of the perſe-ution, ſeems ſtrange. And it is not eaſie to be magined, or believed, how this could have been o ſuddenly received through all the Churches, oth *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern*, and that there was one to witneſs againſt it; and that neither he ſincerity of ſome Presbyters, nor the pride

of others, ſhould have moved them to appear for their priviledges againſt this uſurpation: And how neither Heretick, nor Schiſmatick, ſave one, and that about two hundred years after, ſhould have charged the Church with this: on the contrary, all of them having their own Biſhops; and how this Government continued in ſo peaceable poſſeſſion through the ſucceſſion of ſo many ages, till of late, that even fundamentals are brought under debate; if this ſuperiority were either ſo criminal, as ſome hold it to be, or had not been introduced at leaſt by ſome Apoſtolical men, if not by the Apoſtles themſelves, will not be eaſily cleared.

In the next *Century* we have *Tertullian* ſpeaking clearly of the difference of *Biſhops*, *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, *lib. de bapt. Dandi quidem jus habet ſummus Sacerdos, qui & Epiſcopus; dehinc Presbyteri & Diaconi, non tamen ſine Epiſcopi authoritate, propter Eccleſiæ bonum.* Idem *de præſcript. adverſ. hær. cap.* 32. *Cæterum ſi quæ (præſcriptiones) ſe audent inferere ætati Apoſtolicæ, ut ita videantur ab Apoſtolis tradita. ----- Edant ergo origines Eccleſiarum ſuarum, evolvant ordinem Epiſcoporum ſuorum, ita per ſucceſſiones ab initio decurrentem, ut primus ille Epiſcopus, aliquem ex Apoſtolis, vel Apoſtolicis viris, qui tamen cum Apoſtolis perſeverarent, habuerit authorem & anteceſſorem: hoc enim modo Eccleſiæ Apoſtolicæ cenſus ſuus* defe

deferunt, ſicut Smyrneorum Eccleſia habens Polycarpum, à Joanne collocatum refert: ſicut Romanorum à Petro Clementem ordinatum edit. Proinde utique & cæteræ exhibent, quos ab Apoſtolis in Epiſcopatu conſtitutos Apoſtolici ſeminis traduces habeant; conſingant tale aliquid hæretici. He alſo *lib. 4. cont. Marcionem, cap. 5.* ſaith, *Ordo tamen Epiſcoporum ad originem recenſus, in Joannem ſtabit authorem.* By which we ſee that he both judged Biſhops to be of an Apoſtolical origine, and that he counted them different from Presbyters. A little after him was *Clemens Alex.* who *6. Strom. p. 667.* ſpeaking of the Conſtitution of the Chriſtian Churches, ſaith, there were among them πρωτοπαὶ ἐπισκόπων, πρεσβυτέρων καὶ διακόνων, which he thinks was taken from the Angelick glory, and from their œconomy and adminiſtration.

We ſhal alſo find through all *Cyprian* his Epiſtles this diſparity ſo clear, that it cannot be denyed, and yet we find him as condeſcending as any. *Epiſt. 6.* writing to his Clergy, he ſaith: *Solus reſcribere nihil potui, quando à primordio Epiſcopatus mei ſtatuerim nihil ſine conſilio veſtro, & ſine conſenſu plebis meæ, privata gerere ſententia.* But even this looks like a yeelding to a diminution of that plenitude of power to which he might have pretended, *Epiſt. 65.* writing to *Rogatian*, who had adviſed with him concerning a Deacon

that had carryed inſolently toward him, he writes: *Pro Epiſcopatûs vigore, & Cathedræ authoritate, haberes poteſtatem, qua poſſes de illo ſtatim vindicari.* (and about the end) *Hæc ſunt enim initia hæreticorum, & ortus atque conatus Schiſmaticorum male cogitantium, ut ſibi placeant, ut præpoſitum ſuperbo tumore contemnant, ſic de Eccleſiâ receditur, ſic altare profanum foris collocatur, ſic contra pacem CHRISTI, & ordinationem, atque unitatem DEI rebellatur.* Likewiſe we find *Epiſt.* 31. written to *Cyprian*, by the *Clerus Romanus*, the Seat being then vacant, what ſenſe they had of the Biſhops power, when they ſay: *Poſt exceſſum nobiliſſimæ memoriæ Fabiani, nondum eſt Epiſcopus propter rerum & temporum difficultates conſtitutus, qui omnia iſta moderetur, & eorum qui lapſi ſunt poſſit cum authoritate & conſilio habere rationem.* And if in any caſe we receive a teſtimony, it ſhould be from the mouth of thoſe who can only pretend to be injured. My next witneſs ſhall be *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria*, whoſe fame and authority was inferior to none of the age he lived in. I do not bring his words to prove there were Biſhops in the Church in his time, ſince that is denyed by none: But to prove how full and abſolut the authority of the Biſhops was then, and that the Presbyters were ſimply determined by their commands. Great care was uſed to keep the Chriſtian Aſſemblies pure; and

there-

herefore ſuch as fell in ſcandalous ſins, chiefly heſe who apoſtatiſed in the perſecution, were ot admitted to the Communion of the faithful, ut after a long and heavy penitence: And a queſtion riſing, What ſhould be done with thoſe who died before they finiſhed their penitence: he in his Letter to *Fabius* Biſhop of *Rome*, telling that ſignal ſtory of *Serapion*, ſhews that in his Dioceſs the Presbyters ſent the Euchariſt to he ſick who deſired it, though they died before they had compleated their penitence: and he adds how this was by his authority, ἐντολῆς δὲ ἦν ἐμοῦ διδομένης, τὰς ἀπαλλαττομένας τοῦ βίου, εἰ δέοιντο, καὶ μάλιστα εἰ καὶ πρότερον, ἱκετεύσαντες τύχοιεν, ἀφίεσθαι: ἵν ἐυέλπιδες ἀπαλλάττωνται. Where from the ſtile of *a command given by him, which was the rule of his Presbyters*, and the reſt of hat Epiſtle, it is as clear as any matter of fact an be, that the authority of *Biſhops over their Presbyters was then full, abſolut, and undiſputed.*

If we will believe *Euſebius*, who certainly hath been a diligent and great collector, as any of all the Ancients, the whole tract, both of his Hiſtory and Chronology, runs fully in this train; and he gives us the Catalogues of the Biſhops of the Patriarchal Sees, from the dayes of he Apoſtles to his own time. And though it is ot to be denyed that he hath been too credulous in ſome inſtances; yet it is hard to think he could

could have been miſtaken in ſuch a tract of ſo many particulars. And we ſee from the ſixth Canon of the Council of *Nice*, τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω. That the power of *Metropolitans* over Biſhops, was then accounted by that Council an ancient cuſtome; neither was there ever any oppoſition made to this before *Aërius*, who upon that account is reckoned an Heretick by *Epiph. lib. 3. hær. 75.* and alſo by *Auguſtin ad Quod vult Deum, hær. 53. Epiphanius* adds, that he was an *Arrian*, and gives the account of his opinion in this matter, thus: *Aërius* being a Presbyter in *Sebaſtia*, was offended when *Euſtathius* was preferred before him to that Biſhoprick: and though *Euſtathius* took all ways to gain him, and committed the *Xenodochium* that was there to his inſpection, yet *Aërius* too deeply irritated at the preference, ſaid: *Quid eſt Epiſcopus a Presbyterum; nihil differt hic ab illo, unus enim eſt honor, unus ordo, & una dignitas. Imponit manum Epiſcopus, ita etiam Presbyter; lavacrum dat Epiſcopus, ſimiliter & Presbyter. Diſpenſationem cultûs divini facit Epiſcopus, facit & Presbyter ſimiliter ſedet Epiſcopus in throno, ſedet etiam Presbyter.* By which he deceived many, and had diverſe followers: but it ſeems they have died with their Author, for we hear no more of them.

Medina in the Council of *Trent*, numbred with *Aërius*, *Jerome*, *Ambroſe*, *Auguſtine*

Chry

hryſoſtom, Theodoret, Primaſius, and *Sedulius*, as if hey had been of the ſame mind, wherein he cer-inly ſpoke raſhly, and was either ignorant or deliberat. We have already conſidered both *erome* and *Ambroſe*, or rather *Hilarie* the Dea-on, their opinions in this matter.

All that is gathered from *Auguſtin*, is, ep. *ad Hieronymum*, where he ſaith: *Quanquam ſecun-um honorem vocabulorum, quæ jam uſus obtinuit, Epiſcopatus Presbyterio major ſit, multis tamen in re-us Auguſtino Hieronymus major eſt.* Whence ome would infer that the difference of theſe was only in words, and brought in but by cu-ſtom: But how thin and weak this is, it being ut a ſmooth complement, will appear to all, eſpecially if they ſet it in the ballance with he great evidence that ſtands upon the other ide.

Chryſoſtome hom. 11. on 1. *Tim.* when he is giving the reaſon, why the Apoſtle paſſeth from Biſhops to Deacons, without giving rules to Presbyters, ſaith, the reaſon was, ὅτι ὁ πολὺ τὸ μέσον, καὶ γὰρ, καὶ αὐτοὶ διδασκαλίαν ἀναδεδεγμένοι, καὶ προστασίαν τῆς ἐκκλησίας. And a little after, he taxeth what that little betwixt them was, τῇ γὰρ χειροτονίᾳ μόνῃ αὐτῶν ὑπερβεβήκασι, καὶ τούτῳ μόνον, δοκοῦσι πλεονεκτεῖν τὰς πρεσβυτέρους. But this is far from ſaying that they were all one; and that there ought to be no difference betwixt them

them. *Chryſoſt.* alſo in his firſt homily on the *Phil.* 1. *cap.* on the word οὐ σὺν ἐπισκόποις, ſaith, *Quid hoc rei eſt? An unius Civitatis plures erant Epiſcopi? nullo modo. Verum ſit Presbyteros vocavit, tunc enim nomina invicem communicabant, & Diaconus dicebatur Epiſcopus.* And there he ſhows that Biſhop & Presyter were taken promiſcouſly; for which he cites that of *Timothues* being ordained by the Impoſition of the hands of the Presbyterie, which he ſaith is to be underſtood of Biſhops. *Quia Presbyteri Epiſcopum non ordinaſſent.* (And a little after) *Etiam Presbyteri olim appellabantur Epiſcopi, & Diaconi Chriſti, & Epiſcopi Chriſti, unde nunc etiam multi Presbyteri & Diaconi ſcribuntur Epiſcopi.* But he adds, that in proceſs of time, each had their proper names appropriated to them.

Oecumeneus and *Theophilact*, in this, and all other things, follow *Chryſoſtome* κατὰ πόδας. As alſo *Primaſius*, who on 1 *Tim.* 3. gives the reaſon, why the Presbyters are not named. *Eos in Epiſcoporum ordine comprehendit, quia ſecundus, imo pène unus eſt gradus.* *Sedulius Scotus* on the 1. of *Titus*, ſaith *verbatim*, that which *Jerome* hath on the ſame place, and ſo it is to be conſidered as all one with him on the matter.

But *Theodorets* opinion is a little more perplext, who on 1. *Tim.* tells, that *the ſame perſons were called ſometimes Presbyters, ſometimes*

Biſhops

Biſhops: but theſe who are now called Biſhops, were then called Apoſtles, and that in the progreſs of time they left the name of Apoſtles, and the name of Biſhops was appropriated to them who were firſt called Apoſtles. Thus he. Theſe words it ſeems dropped from him without conſideration, for there is no ſhadow of ground to believe it was ſo; otherwiſe how came it, that the Apoſtle gave no rules for them, under that name. But theſe words are ſufficiently toſſed by *Petavius* and *Walo Meſſalinus*. And thus far we have an ingenous account of the various ſentiments of the *Fathers*, about the diſparity of *Biſhops* and *Presbyters*.

The next thing in this *Canon* to be conſidered is, what is meant by χειροτονία. It is unqueſtionable, that by this is underſtood Ordination by Impoſition of hands, for all the Ancients uſe χειροτονία, & χειροθεσία promiſcuouſlie: But Criticks judge that by the former we are to underſtand all that pertained to the Ordination, and the whole Office of it, and that the latter is to be reſtrained to that particular rite of Impoſition of hands given in the Ordination. Nor do I remember of any place, where χειροτονία ſtands for the Election of Church-men, except in the 5. *Canon* of *Laodicea*, which diſcharges it to be in the preſence of the hearers: and if we compare that with the 13. *Canon* of the ſame

Coun-

Council, which diſcharges the popular elections, we ſhal ſee the reaſon why they likewiſe forbid the elections to be in the peoples hearing, which was for avoiding tumults. *Balſamon* on this *Canon* refutes their miſtake, who underſtood it περὶ ψήφου, which was διὰ τὴν τῶν χειροτονιῶν ἔκτασιν, who founded their gloſs on that *Canon* of *Laodicea*, (which *Zonaras* and *Ariſtenus* doth) *Quæ enim fit in Eccleſia ordinatio per preces myſticas peragitur, etiamſi fiat coram multis.* And he proves his gloſs from the 4. *Canon* of *Nic.* which appoints the elections of the Biſhops to be by the whole Biſhops of the Province, or by three at leaſt. Therefore this Canon cannot be meant of the elections of Biſhops, ſince two ſuffice by this rule for a χειροτονία; and by the recurring of this ſame word in the next Canon, he confirms his aſſertion, ſince Presbyters and Deacons were not (according to him) elected by ſuffrages. Whence we ſee, how groundleſs a nycety theirs is, who would diſtinguiſh them, as if the former had been the election, the latter the ordination. It is true χειροτονέω is in the *Greek* Authors almoſt conſtantly taken for the election of Magiſtrats, which was ordinarily done in *Greece* by the extenſion or elevation of the hand; ſo *Budæus* upon the word, and *Cicero pro Flacco* ſpeaks of their *pſephiſmata porrigenda manu, profundendoque clamore concitata.* But that diſtinction

is

s not obſerved in ſacred Writings, in which heſe minut Critical modes of ſpeaking are not ttended to, and ſince, before they were to lay n hands, they were to ſtretch forth their hands n the head of the perſon, this word is not improperly uſed for that action: and therefore, *Acts* 14. 23. χειροτονήσαντες is uſed of *Paul* and *Barnabas* their ordaining of Elders, where it is lear, it cannot be meant of the election by the eople, but of their Ordination of Paſtors.

This word in Scripture is alſo uſed for an appointment, or election, *Acts* 10. 41. προχειροτονία is taken for GODS election; and 2. *Cor.* 8. 19. it is applyed to theſe who were choſen o carrie a meſſage. As for the Ordination of Church-men, it is nothing elſe but *a ſolemn Ceremony of bleſſing them, by laying on of hands.* We find of old, that all who were called out for any divine ſervice, were ſolemnly ſeparated for it, ſo were both Kings, Prieſts, and Prophets. And the Law of Nature ſaith, that to all functions for which a great veneration is due, there ſhould be a ſolemn inauguration. The laying of the hand upon the head, was the rite of Benediction, *Gen.* 48. 14. *Jacob* bleſſing *Joſephs* children doth it with that Ceremony: In like manner, *Deut.* 34. 19. did *Moſes* bleſs *Joſhuah.* We ſee alſo by the ſinners laying on their hands on the head of the Sacrifice, that it was a Ceremonie

monie uſed in the devoting of things to GOD, whence might riſe that phraſe among the *Latins caput devovere.* And upon theſe accounts, this was appropriated to the ordination of Churchmen, who are to be both bleſſed, and devoted to GOD.

We find this ceremony alſo uſed in the New Teſtament on many and different occaſions; ſometimes when they healed diſeaſes, *Mark* 16. 8. *They ſhal lay their hand on the ſick, and they ſhal recover.* And our LORD uſually touched the ſick with his hand. *Acts* 28. 8, *S. Paul* layes his hands on *Publius*. Likewiſe, when they conferred the holy Ghoſt on any who were baptized, they uſed this ceremony, ſo *Acts* 8. 17. *and* 19. 6. And further, when they appointed any for the Miniſtery of the Goſpel, they ſeparated and bleſſed them, by the laying on of hands; ſo 1. *Tim.* 4. 15. *and* 5. 22. *and* 2. *Tim.* 1. 6. Deacons were alſo ordained by this ceremony, *Acts* 6. 6. As alſo when they ſent any on a particular miſſion, though already ſanctified for the work of the Goſpel, they layd hands on them: ſo *Acts* 13. 3. *Paul* and *Barnabas* were ordained for the Miniſtery of the *Gentils*. From all which it is clear that they uſed impoſition of hands, as the conſtant ceremony of benediction, and as a concomitant of it, and not as a ceremony of it ſelf ſignificant and ſacramental.

Among

Among the Ancients, impoſition of hands was uſed not only in Confirmation, which is undoubted, and is by many founded on that of *Hebrews* 6. 2. where laying on of hands being joyned with Baptiſm, and reckoned among foundations, ſeems to be common to all Chriſtians. But they alſo uſed it in the receiving of penitents: ſo 19. Canon of *Laodicea*.

As for the form of ordaining Biſhops, we ſee here it was to be done by Biſhops, which is agreed to by all, only *Eutychius* ſeems to ſay, that in *Alexandria* Presbyters ordained the Biſhop. But as for the number of the Biſhops who were to ordain, this ſeems to be later, and more ſutable to the ſtate of the Churches after they were conſtituted, then while they were under perſecution. The number of three was appointed, *Conc. Arel.* 1. *Can.* 21. *Nic. Can.* 4. *Arel.* 2. *Can.* 5. *Carth.* 2. *Can.* 12. And ſee more of this *Gratian dist.* 64. This ſeems to have been founded on *Timothies* ordination, which is ſaid to have been done by the Presbytery, which *Chryſoſtome* underſtands of a company of Biſhops. But it is not probable, that in the time of perſecution, when Biſhops neither durſt leave their own flocks, nor meet in any number, this was then obſerved; and diverſe accounts are given of ordinations, where we hear only of one Biſhop ordaining. *Gregory Thaumaturg* was

ordained by *Fidimus* Bishop of *Amasia*, who went to the wilderness to seek him. And there are many instances among the lives of the solitaries, of such as were brought to a Bishop, and ordained by him, without any other assisting him. So *Synesius Epist. 67.* tells how *Siderius* was ordained a Bishop, only by *Philo* Bishop of *Cyrene*; and tho he call that a transgression of the ἀκριβεια, and confesseth it was not ἐνθέσμως, but ἐκθέσμως, since he was neither ordained in *Alexandria*, nor by three Bishops; yet he justifies it from the necessity of the times wherein such freedom of Assemblies was not safe. And *Gregory the Great* allowed *Augustin* to ordain alone in *England*; who upon that did ordain some Bishops alone, as *Beda* relates. *Dionysius* the *Areopagite cap. 5. de Eccles. hierar.* giving the account of the ordination of Bishops, represents it as done by one person. *Anno* 555. after *Vigilius* Bishop of *Rome* his death, *Pelagius* who got himself made his successor, being suspected of accession to his death, could only get two Bishops, to wit, *Joannes Perusinus*, and *Bonus Ferentinus*; who with *Andreas* Presbyter of *Ostia*, laid hands on him. And here is a Presbyter laying hands on a Bishop. The Church of *Rome*, at this day, ordinarly dispenseth with this, so that one Bishop and two Abbots do often ordain Bishops.

The

The *Areopagite loc. cit.* gives the account of the Biſhops ordination, whom he always calls ἱεραρχὴς, thus: *He who was to be ordained, was brought to another Biſhop, and kneeling before the altar, the Goſpels were layd on his head, and the Biſhops hand, and ſo he was conſecrated with a holy prayer, and then marked with the ſign of the croß; and laſt of all, ſaluted by the Biſhop, and whole holy Order.* His theory on this is: *Their coming to the altar, ſhows the ſubjecting of their whole life to GOD. Laying on of hands, is as a fathers bleſſing of his child. The ſign of the croß ſignifies, that they are to follow CHRIST, even to the croß. Their ſalutation ſignifies their union one with another: and the Goſpel is layd on the Biſhops head, becauſe he being the head of the Hierarchy, is to illuminate the reſt.*

With this agrees the fourth Council of *Carthage*, where the rules are at length ſet down for the tryals and qualifications of Biſhops: and Canon firſt, at the end, we have, *Cum in his omnibus, examinatus, fuerit inventus plene inſtructus, tunc cum conſenſu Clericorum & laicorum, & conventu totius provinciæ Epiſcoporum, maximeq; Metropolitani vel authoritate vel præſentiâ, ordinetur Epiſcopus:* And Canon ſecond: *Epiſcopus quum ordinatur, duo Epiſcopi ponant & teneant Evangeliorum codicem ſuper caput & cervicem* (aliter *verticem*) *ejus, & uno ſuper eum fundente benedictionem,*

reliqui omnes Epiſcopi, qui adſunt, manibus ſuis caput ejus tangant. And of this ſee *Gratian diſt.* 23. *&* 77. where we find a Biſhop was to be five years a *Lector* or *Exorciſt*, fourteen years an *Acoluth* or *Subdeacon*, and five years a *Deacon*, ere he be a *Presbyter*, and then he may hope for the higheſt degree. But in another Chapter it is ſaid, he muſt be ten years a *Presbyter*, ere he can be a *Biſhop*. And in another Chapter, none could be a *Deacon* under twenty-five years of age. But by the Civil Law, the age both of Biſhop and Presbyter is the ſame; to wit, thirty-five. Theſe previous degrees were introduced, and the years of tryal in them were appointed, that all might be prepared and rightly formed before they were admitted to the government of the Church. Among other ceremonies in the ordination of Biſhops, in ſome places they were anointed with the *Chriſma*. *Nazianz. Orat.* 20. tells, that his father had ſo anointed *Baſile:* and *Orat.* 5. tells, that himſelf was ſo ordained: but it ſeems that that was a cuſtom peculiar to that Countrey, ſince we meet not with it ſo early elſewhere.

As for the elections of Biſhops, we have ſeen from *Jerome* and *Eutychius*, how the Presbyters did chooſe the Biſhop. But in *Africk*, the Synod with the Clergy, and the people did it; of which we have a full account from *Cyprian epiſt.* 68.

68. *De traditione divinâ & Apoſtolicâ obſervatione tenendum eſt, & obſervandum quod apud nos quoque, & fere per Provincias univerſas tenetur, ut ad ordinationes rite celebrandas, ad eam plebem cui præpoſitus ordinatur, Epiſcopi ejuſdem Provinciæ proximi quique conveniant, & Epiſcopus delegatur plebe præſente, quæ ſingulorum vitam pleniſſime novit, & unuſcujuſque actum de ejus converſatione perſpexerit.* And a little before, he ſaith, *Plebs ipſa maxime habet poteſtatem vel eligendi dignos Sacerdotes, vel indignos recuſandi.* And from that of *Numb.* 10. where *Moſes* ſtript *Aaron*, and clothed *Eleazar* before all the Congregation, he proves that it was of divine authority, that the Sacerdotal ordinations ſhould not be, *niſi ſub populi aſſiſtentis conſcientiâ, ut plebe præſente, vel deteganntur malorum crimina, vel bonorum merita prædicentur, & ſit ordinatio juſta & legitima, quæ omnium judicio & ſuffragio erit examinata.* And this courſe, he ſaith, held in the ordination both of Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons. And *Epiſt.* 33. he excuſeth himſelf, that he had ordained one a Lector without the conſent of his people, though he had been a Confeſſor in the perſecution. The Epiſtle is directed to the Presbyters, Deacons, and the whole people, and begins: *In ordinationibus Clericis ſolemus vos ante conſulere, & mores ac merita ſingulorum communi conſilio ponderare.*

All that we meet with cõcerning this in Scripture, is the chooſing of the Deacons by the people, *Acts* 6. for that of *Acts* 14. 23. is clearly miſapplyed. 1 *Tim.* 3. a Deacõ ſhould be firſt approven, and *Titus* 1. 6. a Biſhop muſt be ἀνεπίλημπτος; and thereby it appears, that certainly ſome enquiry was to be made into his converſation, which at leaſt muſt have been a promulgation before hand. So we find *Conc. Chalc. can.* 6. ὁ χειροτονούμενος ἐπινεύστοιτο. And *Lampridius* in the life of *Alexander Severus* tells, that he uſed ſuch a courſe before he made any Governor of a Province. *Dicebatque grave eſſe non fieri in Provinciarum rectoribus, cum id Chriſtiani & Judæi facerent in prædicandis Sacerdotibus, qui ordinandi ſunt.*

But there were frequent diſorders in theſe elections, which occaſioned the 13. Canon of the Council of *Laodicea*, Περὶ τοῦ, μὴ τοῖς ὄχλοις ἐπιτρέπειν τὰς ἐκλογὰς ποιεῖσθαι τῶν μελλόντων καθίστασθαι εἰς ἱερατεῖαν: and by the Canon goeth before that, the election of Biſhops is committed to the Biſhops of the Province, which was alſo eſtabliſhed by the Council of *Nice*, fourth and ſixth Canon. Likewiſe *Juſtinian*, *Nov.* 123. *cap.* 1. excludes the people from the election of the Biſhop, but leaves it to the Clergie, and the *primores Civitatis*, to name a liſt of three, out of which the *Metropolitan was to chooſe one.* The Biſhops were to be ordained in the preſence of the

the people, where every one might propoſe his exceptions, why he might not be ordained, which were to be examined before they proceeded to the ordination. So *Conc. Antioch. Canon* 19. and *Carthag. Canon* 49. and *Juſtinian tit.* 1. *Nov. conſt.* 1. 2. 17. according to *Photius in Nomocan. tit.* 1. *cap.* 8. Yet theſe popular elections were not wholly taken away, and at leaſt the peoples conſent was asked: but there were great diſorders in theſe elections. *Nazianz. orat.* 14. at his fathers funeral inſtanceth them in two caſes at *Ceſarea*, where his father was preſent; in which there were factions at the election of the Biſhop: In one of them it was that *Baſil* was choſen.

Ammian Marcellin tells what tumults were at *Rome* in the elections of their Biſhops; of whom he ſaith; *Supra modum humanum ad rapiendam ſedem Epiſcopalem ardebant*: ſo that at the election of *Damaſus* the faction betwixt his electors, and thoſe that were for *Urſicinus*, brake out into ſuch a tumult, that there were *in Baſilicâ Sicinini, ubi ritus Chriſtianus eſt conventiculum, centum triginta ſeptem peremptorum cadavera reperta, lib.* 27. And he adds, It was no wonder they ſtruggled ſo about it, becauſe *id adepti futuri ſunt ita ſecuri, ut ditentur oblationibus matronarum, procedantque vehiculis inſidentes, circumſpecte veſtiti, epulas curames profuſas, adeo ut eorum convivia*

Regales ſuperent menſas, qui eſſe poterant beati revera, ſi urbis magnitudine deſpecta quam vitijs opponunt, ad imitationem quorundam provincialium Antiſtitum viverent, quos tenuitas edendi potandique parciſſimè, vilitas etiam indumentorum & ſupercilia humum ſpectantia perpetuo Numini, veriſque ejus cultoribus, ut puros commendant & verecundos.

Becauſe of thoſe diſorders in elections, it was that *Nazianz. orat.* 19. wiſhed, that the elections were only or chiefly in their hands who ſerved at their Altar. *Sic enim nunquam Eccleſiis male eſſet.* Therefore he deſires they ſhould no more be committed *ijs qui opibus ac potentiâ pollent aut plebis impetui ac temeritati, atque etiam plebeiorum viliſſimo aut contemptiſſimo cuique*, as had been before. Adding, that the diſorders which were in ſuch elections, made him loath his life, and long to be in a wilderneſs.

One effect of theſe confuſed elections was, that ſome who were not Presbyters, nay not ſo much as Chriſtians, were choſen Biſhops: for *orat.* 20. on *Baſil*, when he tells how *Baſil* was firſt ordained a Presbyter, he regrates that many Biſhops oftimes leaped into the chair without any preceeding degree, which was contrary to Nature and reaſon, ſince among Sailors none is made at firſt a Pilot: nor is there any at firſt made a General among Souldiers. *Nunc autem periculum eſt, ne ordo omnium ſanctiſſimus,*

omnium

mnium maximè ſit ridiculus: non enim virtute magis, quàm maleficio, & ſcelere Sacerdotium paratur, nec dignioruṁ, ſed potentiorum throni ſunt. Adding that none is called a Phyſician, before he underſtand diſeaſes, nor a Painter before he can mix colors. *Antiſtes contra facile invenitur, non elaboratus, ſed recens. ---- Uno die ſanctos fingimus, eoſque ſapientes & eruditos eſſe jubemus, qui nihil didicerunt: nec ad Sacerdotium quicquam prius contulerunt quam velle.* And *orat.* 19. he tells how in *Ceſarea* at an election of a Biſhop, his father and other Biſhops being preſent, there aroſe a great ſedition about it, which could not be eaſily compoſed, partly thorow the peoples fervor about the faith, partly thorow the eminence of the chair, which made the contentions greater. But at length the whole people with one conſent made choice of a perſon of great quality, but not yet baptized, to be their Biſhop: from which he was very averſe, but they took him by force, and by the aſſiſtance of ſome ſouldiers then in the Citie, haled him to the Church, and deſired the Biſhops, not without threats, to ordain him: whereupon they overawed by fear and force, firſt purified him, and then ſet him upon the throne; but more with their hands then with their heart. *Chryſoſt.* alſo *lib.* 3. *de Sacerdotio, cap.* 15. ſhows the evil of theſe popular elections, and that in them

them they looked more to riches and honor, then to true worth.

But where the Synodical elections were set up, the people were not wholly excluded from their intereſt in the choice, as we ſee particularly in the Churches of *Milan* and *Hippo*. Neither were theſe Synodical elections ſo regular as *Nazianzen* hoped, which appears from two famous inſtances of *Nectarius* and *Ambroſius*.

Nectarius came to the Council of *Conſtantinople* in the company of *Diodorus* Biſhop of *Tarſus*: and then it was, that upon ſome differences (as you ſhal ſee afterwards) *Nazianzen* retired from *Conſtantinople*. And *Nectarius* thinking to go home to his Countrey, came to his Biſhop *Diodorus* to ask his bleſſing, and receive his commands. But at that time all *Diodorus* thoughts were, how a fit perſon might be found for *Conſtantinople*, and looking on *Nectarius* conſidering his gravity, his gray hairs, and ſweet temper, he thought (it ſeems by a divine inſpiration) what if he were made Biſhop? And thereupon pretending another errand, he took him to the Biſhop of *Antioch*, and whiſpering him in the ear, bade him conſider how fit a perſon *Nectarius* might prove for the Biſhoprick of *Conſtantinople*. *Meletius* laughed in his heart at *Diodorus* his ſimplicity, who ſhould

think

ink of *Nectarius*, when ſo many famous men
d been named for that See by their Biſhops.
fter that, *Theodoſius* the Emperor commanded
e Synod to give him in writing a liſt of ſuch
erſons as were judged fit for that chair, which
eing laid upon *Miletius* to draw, he to gratifie
Diodorus, puts *Nectarius* among them. The Em-
eror at firſt reading began to think of *Necta-*
rius: but at ſecond reading, poſitively conclu-
ed that he muſt be the Biſhop. The Synod
as amazed, and began to enquire about him,
nd found that he was but a *Catechumen*, where-
pon they deſired the Emperor to change his
ind; but he continuing reſolute, the Synod
eelded: and after they had baptized him, they
rdained him Biſhop. And by this we ſee that
he Synod made the liſt, but the *Emperor* na-
ed the perſon.

Near of kin to this is the ſtorie of *Ambroſe*.
fter *Auxentius* the Biſhop of *Milan* his death,
Valentinian the Emperor called a Council of Bi-
hops, and appointed them to chooſe ſome ho-
y and fit perſon to be Biſhop there, *Cujus autho-*
ritati & nos ſubjiciamur, cujuſque reprehenſiones fer-
e non dubitemus. Etenim ut Imperatores nos ſimus,
& rerum potiamur, homines tamen eſſe nos, & hu-
manis lapſibus obnoxios fatendum nobis eſt. But the
Synod referred the election back to him, that
he might name the perſon, yet he refuſed it,

and

and told them, it was their business, adding, *Ego vero, id & viribus meis majus & ab officio meo alienum judico.* But as they went to consult about this, the people of *Milan* did all run together to the Church to choose their Bishop, some of them were *Arrians*, and others *Orthodox*, and each party was contending to have the Bishop chosen of their own side. At that time *Ambrose* a Noble *Roman* of the Consular Order, was Prefect there, to whom *Valentinian*, when he sent him to that charge, said, *Vade, age non ut Judex sed ut Episcopus.* He fearing that the concourse of the people might end in a tumult, came among them to prevent that, and with great sweetness exhorted them to calmness and unity; whereupon they much taken with his speech, cryed out with one accord; *Let Ambrose be Bishop.* But he resisted this as much as he could, and did chide them for their indeliberat choice of a fecular person, who was a stranger to Ecclesiastical affairs, and not so much as initiated into the faith, for he was not then baptized. Yet the Synod approving of their election; he was first baptized, and then ordained Bishop. But *Paulinus* adds, that after his Baptism, he past in order through all the Ecclesiastical degrees, and on the eight day was ordained Bishop there. Thus went the Synodical elections: but it was a great while before that, even in the elections of

the

he *Biſhops of Rome*, the people were wholly bar-
ed from their priviledges. And of all this ſee at
arge *Antonius de Dominis*, *lib.* 3. *de Repub. Ec-*
leſ. cap. 3.

Metropolitans were choſen by the Patri-
rchs, and the Patriarchs by the Emperors: but
n ſome caſes, the Emperors took the elections
mply to themſelves; at other times, they re-
erved only the ratification of them to them-
elves: and ſo for a great while, the elections of
he Biſhops of *Rome* were to be ratified, either
y the Emperors of the Eaſt, or by their *Exarchs*
t *Ravenna*. And after that *Charles the Great* aſ-
umed the Empire of the Weſt, it was decreed
n a Synod at *Rome*, that the election of the *Ro-*
an Biſhop belonged to him: and accordingly
e was in poſſeſſion of it, though his ſucceſſors
id ſimply ſlip from it. Now the elections are
n the hands of the Chanons and Prebends,
hich is an art to make the election go what
ay the Superior will. But the Chapters choo-
ng the Biſhop, was not known to the Ancients,
belonging to the whole Colledge of the Preſ-
yters without diſtinction. And all who deſire
he reſtitution of Church diſcipline, think, that
he erecting of Provincial Synods, and giving
he power of electing Biſhops to them, is both
he beſt method, and moſt agreeable to all An-
iquity.

A See was not to ly vacant over three mo neths, nor the ordination of a Biſhop delayed except upon an inexcuſable neceſſity, otherwiſe the Metropolitan was lyable to cenſure; *Con Chalc. can.* 25. and in the Council of *Sardic can.* 10. *Oſius* propoſed, that none ſhould be Bi ſhop till he had paſſed through all the inferio degrees, and had finiſhed the Miniſtery of Lector, Deacon, and Presbyter; and to this a the Biſhops there preſent gave their conſent but by the inſtances already marked, we ſee tha this order was not univerſally obſerved. *Nov* 123. it is decreed, that a Biſhop be at leaſt thre moneths among the Clergy, before he be or dained, that he may be inſtructed in the Eccle ſiaſtical Miniſtery and ſervice.

Another cuſtom there had been of Biſhop ordaining ſucceſſors for themſelves: ſo *Euſeb lib. 7. cap.* 26. or according to the *Greek* divi ſion, κεφ βλ. tells how *Theotecnus* Biſhop of *Ceſa rea*, ordained *Anatolius* to be his ſucceſſor, an that for ſome time they were both Biſhops toge ther. In other places they did not ordain, bu only deſign their ſucceſſors. Yet *Auguſtin* wa ordained Biſhop of *Hippo* by his predeceſſo *Valerius*; but he apologizes for this, *Epiſt.* 110 and ſaith, that he did not know that it was con trary to the Council of *Nice*, which decree that there ſhould be but one Biſhop at once in

City

ity. And from that Epiſtle we ſee it was or-
inary for Biſhops to deſign their ſucceſſors,
hich was done to prevent the tumults were
ſually in elections. And *Auguſtin* tells of a diſ-
rder which had been in a neighbor Town, be-
auſe the Biſhop, though he had deſigned his
ucceſſor, yet had not publiſhed it. Therefore
e to evite that hazard, deſigned *Eradius* to be
is ſucceſſor, to which all the people aſſented.
et leſt this might have opened a door for Bi-
hops to have tranſmitted their Sees to their kin-
red or friends, it was decreed in the Council
f *Antioch*, *Can.* 23. that any ſuch deſignation of
ucceſſors made by Biſhops, ſhould be declared
ull, and that the election of the *Biſhop* ſhould
e in the hands of the *Biſhops* of that Synod
here the See lay.

There might be but one *Biſhop* in a City for
nities ſake, yet ſometime there were Coadju-
ors: ſo *Nazianzen* was Coadjutor to his father.
And *Auguſtin* in his ſecond Conference with the
Donatiſts, offered that if the *Donatiſts* overcame,
hen they ſhould yeeld their *Biſhopricks* to
hem; but if the *Donatiſts* were overcome by
hem, and ſo ſhould return to the community
f the Church, they ſhould admit them to be
onjunct *Biſhops* with them. So was the Schiſm
n *Antioch* betwixt the *Meletianiſts* and the *Pau-*
ianiſts ſetled, that both ſhould be *Biſhops* toge-

ther,

ther, and all should obey him that survived; t
this they all agreed, confirming it by oath. Y
Flavianus, one of *Meletius* his disciples, after h
death, got himself chosen *Bishop*, but was i
that condemned by all.

It is true, that the *Novatians* in diverse See
had distinct Bishops, but these were Schisma
ticks. Yet in the beginning of Christianity, i
would appear that there were more Bishops i
one place: for *Tertullian* and *Epiphanius* affer
that *Clemens* was ordained Bishop of *Rome* b
S. Peter. And yet all reckon *Linus* to have suc
ceeded him. So also *Evodius* is generally rec
koned to be the first Bishop of *Antioch*; thus *Eu
sebius*, *Origen* and *Jerome*. Yet *Chrysostome* an
Theodoret say, that *Ignatius* was ordained ther
by *S. Peter*. If there be any authority in *Cle
mens* his Constitutions, they offer a clear accoun
of this, that *Evodius* was appointed Bishop o
the Circumcision, and *Ignatius* Bishop of th
Uncircumcision; and that after *Evodius* death
both Churches grew in one. The same also i
applyed to the difference about *Linus*, and *Cle
mens* by others, as if *Linus* had been Bishop o
the Circumcision, and *Clemens* of the Uncircum
cision; and that after *Cletus* death they all grew
in one, and submitted to *Clemens*. However, i
is clear that in every Church there was but on
Bishop: and accordingly was decreed, *Conc*

Nic

Nic. Can. 8. Ἵνα μὴ ἐν τῇ πόλει δύο ἐπίσκοποι ὦσιν. By which ſtile we ſee they guarded againſt the diſorder of two Biſhops in a City, as a thing undoubtedly irregular, which hath been accounted ſo before that time: ſo that this of *one Biſhop in a City*, is not to be accounted an act of that Council; but a reference to ſome former act, or at leaſt an univerſally received practiſe. Yet the firſt ſucceſſion of the Biſhops of *Rome*, tho always perplexed, is much more ſo, from the moſt learned *Voſſius* (his Obſervations in his Letter to *Rivet*, ſubjoyned to *Doctor Pearſons Vindiciæ of Ignatius his Epiſtles:*) who from all the Manuſcripts of *Damaſus* his *lives of the Popes*, informes us, that *S. Peter* did ordain both *Linus* and *Cletus* Biſhops of *Rome:* and after ſome enquiry into the matter, he concludes, that at firſt there were three Biſhops in *Rome* at once, *Linus*, *Cletus*, *Anencletus*. In the next ſucceſſion, he places *Cletus*, *Anencletus* and *Clemens*; but *Anencletus* ſurviving both the other, ſate alone at *Rome:* after whom there was but one Biſhop there. Yet I know not if *Damaſus* ought to have ſuch authority, that upon his teſtimony we are bound to believe a thing ſo different from the accounts given by elder and more unqueſtioned Writers.

All *ambitus* was condemned in Biſhops; but it ſeems that in *Nazianzens* time it was too

common: For he in his Apologetick regrates how some πρὶν ἄξιοι γενέσθαι προσιέναι τοῖς ἱεροῖς μεταιτῶνται τε βήματος, *tanquam non virtutis exemplum, sed victûs parandi occasionem & subsidium hunc ordinem esse judicantes: ac non munus referendis rationibus obnoxium, sed imperium ab omni censurâ immune.* And a little after: *Prius fere quam primam comam abjecerimus, puerili more balbutire desierimus. ----- Si duo aut tria pia verba didicerimus, eaque non ex lectione, sed ex sola auditione hausta, aut Davidi paulum operæ dederimus, aut pallium scite contraxerimus, aut zonâ tenus philosophati fuerimus, pietatis quandam speciem nobis illinentes, ô præfecturam! ô elatum animum!* Justinian *Const. Nov.* 137. *cap.* 1. complains, that *absque examinatione, atque honestatis vitæ testimonio ordinantur Episcopi, Presbyteri, & Diaconi, &c.* And there diverse places out of Nazianzen's Apologetick are cited, to shew that Ordination should be gone about *cum omni diligentiâ atque rigore, Cod. de Epis. & Cler. leg.* 31. *Tantum ab ambitu debet esse sepositus, ut quæratur cogendus, rogatus recedat, invitatus effugiat, sola sibi suffragetur necessitas excusandi. Profecto enim est indignus Sacerdotio, nisi fuerit invitatus, invitus.*

Chrysostom in his third Book *de Sacerdotio, cap.* 10. among the qualifications of a Bishop, reckons for a chief one παντοχόθεν αὐτῷ τῆς τ πράγματος ἐπιθυμίας καθαρεύειν δεῖ τὴν ψυχὴ

Na

Nam ſi ad eum principatum adipiſcendum vehementi animi affectu rapietur, eo adepto impotentiorem ſane ſuæ ambitionis flammam incendet: ac vi tandem captus, ut ſibi adeptum honorem ſtabiliat, nulli non peccato ſerviet: ſeu adulandum, ſeu ſervile quidpiam atque indignum ſuſtinendum, ſeu res magno pecuniæ ſumptu tentanda: nam quod nonnulli cædibus Eccleſias compleverint, contaminarintq; tum ejus honoris gratiâ depugnantes, civitates aliquot funditus everterunt dicere hic prætermitto, ne quibuſdam videar ea in medium afferre quæ fide majora ſunt. And to preoccupy the objection from 1. *Tim.* 1. 3. he adds, Ἐγὼ δὲ ἐ τῷ ἔργῳ, τῆς δὲ αὐθεντείας, καὶ δυναστείας ἐπιθυμεῖν εἶπον εἶναι δεινὸν. And among other advantages of one who wants this too forward deſire, he reckons this ἐδὲ τὴν καθαίρεσιν ἀυτῆς δέδοικε. And with a great deal of ingenuity, he confeſſeth how ſtrong that unlawful deſire was in himſelf, which frighted him from entering in holy Orders.

How far *Nazianzen* was from all *ambitus*, the whole tract of his life doth fully diſcover. He was no ſooner ordained a Presbyter, then he with his friend *Baſile*, at that time likewiſe ordained, fled to *Pontus*, where they lived a great while, purifying their ſouls in the exerciſe of prayer and mortification. After which they returned home. *Nazianzen* out of compaſſion to his father who preſſed his return, and *Baſile*

out of zeal to Religion, and the Church then over-run with *Arrians*; *S. Baſile* by the means of old *Nazianzen*, was choſen and ordained Biſhop of *Ceſarea*, and he ordained *Nazianzen* Biſhop of *Saſime*: but he, what through his love of retirement, what becauſe *Saſime* being a ſtage of the waggoners, was full of ſtirs and diſorders, immediatly left that place, in which he was ſet againſt his heart. And ſome ſay that he never ordained any in it, nor conſecrated the Euchariſt while he was there: neither could ever his father obtain of him to return to it. And when his father dealt earneſtly with him, not without threatning of imprecations, that he would accept the charge of *Nazianz:* in his old age, he with great averſion yeelded to his entreaty, declaring he would ſtay no longer there then his father lived. During which time, he managed that See with a great deal of ſucceſs and applauſe: but after his father died, which was in the hundred year of his age, he continued a little longer there, till his mother who ſurvived her husband ſometime, died alſo. And then he retired to a houſe of holy Virgins in *Seleucia*, that in his abſence they might chooſe another Biſhop: but returning thither a little after, he found they had choſen none; yet he continued ſtiff as an oak, and neither prayers nor tears could prevail with him. Afterward *Conſtantinople*

was

was in great diſorder through the hereſies of *Apollinaris* & *Macedonius* lately ſprung up, beſide the *Arrian*, which was there before: & he being inwardly called of GOD to go thither, and prompted by his friend *Baſile*, and invited by many Biſhops, and honorable Citizens, went and labored among them: not behaving himſelf as their Biſhop, but as a temporary Over-ſeer. And though all the Churches were then poſſeſt by the Hereticks, none remaining for the Orthodox, ſave only *Anaſtaſia*; yet through his labors the face of affairs was quickly altered in *Conſtantinople*. When *Theodoſius* came to *Conſtantinople*, he poſſeſſed him of the great Church: and all the people deſired that he might be enthroned, the Emperor concurring with them in that: but he declined it: And though the Emperor took great pleaſure in him, yet he went ſeldom to the Palace. Then was the ſecond *General Council* called to *Conſtantinople*, and he was by the authority of *Meletius* Biſhop of *Antioch* (of whom we made mention before) confirmed in the Biſhoprick of *Conſtantinople* by the Council. But after this, there aroſe ſome contention by *Timotheus* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, who came later to the Council, and alledged upon the prerogative of his See, that that matter ſhould not have been decided without him. Upon this, hot and

ſharp contentions aroſe among the Biſhops, not ſo much out of any diſpleaſure they had at *Nazianzen*, as out of their mutual jealouſies, though he that writes his life, ſaith, that this was occaſioned by *Meletius* his death. But therein he was miſtaken; for *Meletius* out-lived not only this action, and gave the liſt to *Theodoſius* of thoſe who were deſigned to ſucceed him (*Sozom. lib. 7. cap.* 8.) but he alſo out-lived the Council, and ſubſcribed its acts, and died a little after that in *Conſtantinople*. Upon this contention, *Nazianzen* finding many of thoſe who had before eſtabliſhed him, beginning to reſile, told them how at firſt he had refuſed that Government, though the Church there had been by his labors and pains ſetled, and enlarged; but for that he expected his reward from GOD: yet it ſeemed ſtrange to him, that after he had been forced to accept of it, out of his love to the flock, and preſſed to it with their united ſuffrages, they ſhould now think of undoing what themſelves had done. This he ſaid, not that he deſired riches, or the nobleneſs of that Seat, and to be called *Biſhop* of the Imperial City. *But* he confeſſed, the loſs of his children could not but affect him: beſides, he feared they might ſeem to proceed out of envy or lenity. However, if they deſired it, ἀλύπως τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἐξίσταμαι. ------ *Mihi quidem ſolitudo & olim chara fuit &*

nunc

eſt: ὃ γὰρ δεῦρ ἐιρξουσιν οἱ τὸν θρόνον ἀποστερήσοντες. Whereupon he went out, and retired from the houſe wherein he dwelt, to one more ſecret. But many of the people flocked about him, and with tears beſought him to have compaſſion on them: yet he finding the diſſention about him growing hotter among the Biſhops, went again to the Council, and charged them by the holy Trinity, that they would compoſe their differences peaceably, adding: *But if I ſeem the occaſion of any diſſention among you, I am not more worthy then the Prophet Jonas: throw me in the ſea, and theſe raging billows ſhal quickly be calmed, ſince I ſhal chooſe any thing you pleaſe, ſo if I be innocent, for drawing you to agreement on my account.* Θρόνε ἐξάσατε, πόλεως ἀπελάσατε. μόνον τὴν ἀλήθειαν καὶ τὴν ἐιρηνὴν ἀγαπήσατε. ἔρρωσθε ἱεροὶ ποιμένες. After which he went to the Emperor, and with great earneſtneſs begged his permiſſion to retire: which having obtained, he called the Clergy and people together, and with many tears took leave of them, charging them to continue ſtedfaſt in the faith. This being done, he retired to *Arrianze*, a village of *Cappadocia*, which belonged to him by inheritance, and continued in his retirement, giving himſelf to his Poëtry, till he died in an old age.

That which next occurrs to be conſidered is, in what places Biſhopricks were founded, and

Biſhops ſetled. We find in all Cities where the Goſpel was planted, and Churches conſtituted, that Biſhops were alſo ordained. Among the *Jews*, where ever there were an hundred and twenty of them together, there did they erect a Synagogue. Compare with this *Acts* 1. 15. where the number of thoſe that conſtituted the firſt Chriſtian Church, is the ſame. So it is like where ever there was a competent number of Chriſtians together, that a Church was there ſetled.

Yet in ſome Villages there were Churches and Biſhops; ſo there was a Biſhop in *Bethany*: and *S. Paul* tells of the Church of *Cenchrea*, which was the port of *Corinth*. It is true, ſome think that the Church of *Corinth* met there. So theſe of *Philippi* went out of the City by a river ſide to prayer, *Acts* 16. 13. But we find *Acts* 18. that there was a Synagogue in *Corinth*, and that *S. Paul* ſtayed in the houſe of *Juſtus*, near the Synagogue: and therefore there is no reaſon to think that the Chriſtians ſhould have had their meeting without the City, ſince there was no perſecution then ſtirring: and neither in the *Acts*, nor in any of the *Epiſtles*, is there mention made of their going out to *Cenchrea*. Therefore it is probable that the Church of *Cenchrea* was diſtinct from *Corinth*; and ſince they had *Phebe* for their Deaconneſs, it is not to be doubted but

ut they had both Biſhops and Deacons.

From the ſeveral Cities the Goſpel was dila-
ed and propagated to the places round about.
But in ſome Countreys we find the Biſhopricks
ery thick ſet. They were pretty throng in
Africk, for at a Conference which *Auguſtine* and
he Biſhops of that Province had with the *Do-
atiſts*, there were of Biſhops two hundred eigh-
y ſix preſent, and one hundred and twenty ab-
ent, and ſixty Sees were then vacant, which
ake in all four hundred ſixty and ſix: There
ere alſo two hundred and ſeventy nine of the
Donatiſts Biſhops. *Sozom. lib. 7. hiſt. cap.* 19.
peaking how differently conſtituted ſome
hurches were, he tells how in *Scithya*, though
here were many Cities, yet there was but one
iſhop. But in other Nations there were Bi-
ops even in their villages, as he knew to be a-
ong the *Arabians* and *Cyprians*. *Theodoret* tells,
hat there were eight hundred Pariſhes within
is Dioceſe, *epiſt.* 113. But it is to be obſer-
ed, that in thoſe places where the Goſpel was
ateſt of planting, the Biſhopricks are fewer, and
onſequently larger. It is reported that in the
aſt tract of the *Abyſſin* Churches, there is one
nly Biſhop at *Abuna*. *Balſamon* on the 57. Ca-
on of *Laodicea* tells, that at that time in ſome
hurches of the Eaſt, it was neither ſafe nor ex-
edient for them to have Biſhops: & they were

ſup-

ſupplied by Viſiters, ſent them from other Bi
ſhops, ſo that they had no Biſhops of thei
own: which was occaſioned both by their po
verty, and the ſmalneſs of their number, ye
they were under the care and charge of othe
Biſhops. Some Churches lay long vacant an
without *Biſhops*. In *Carthage*, when *Hunneri*
invaded them, they wanted a Biſhop twenty
four years: and he offering them one, providin
the *Arrians* might have the free exerciſe o
their Religion among them, they anſwered, tha
upon theſe termes *Eccleſia non delectatur Epiſc*
pum habere, ſo *Victor lib. 2. perſ. Vand.* Whe
Meletius was driven out of *Antioch*, for te
years together *Diodorus* and *Flavian* two Pre
byters ruled that Church, *Theodor. lib. 4. hiſ*
cap. 23. Some places are alledged to have ha
the Goſpel long before there were Biſhops a
mong them, and particularly *Scotland*, for *M*
jor lib. 2. cap. 2. ſaith, *per Sacerdotes & Mona*
chos, ſine Epiſcopis Scoti in fide eruditi erant. Th
time of our converſion to the faith is reckone
to have been *anno* 263. And *Palladius* reckone
the firſt Biſhop came not for an hundred and ſe
venty years after that in the year 430. *Fordon*
in his *Chronicle*, *lib. 3. cap. 8.* ſaith, *Ante Pall*
dij adventum habebant Scoti fidei Doctores, & Sacr
mentorum adminiſtratores, Presbyteros ſolum, v
Monachos ritum ſequentes Eccleſiæ primitiv

The

heſe were called *Culdei*, though in ſome bulls ey be *Celli Dei*. *Boëthius* thinks it is *Culdei*, *aſi cultores Dei*: but others judge that it is om the *Cells* wherein they lived, which were ld in great eſteem, and after their death were rned into Churches: and from thence they ink the name *Kil* is to this day ſo much uſed, *Kilpatrick*, *Kilmarnock*, *Kilbride*, &c. Of eſe *Boëthius* ſaith, That by common ſuffrage, ey made choice of one of their number to be ief over them, who was called *Epiſcopus Scorum*: ſo *lib. 6. fol. 92.* This is contradicted by *uchanan lib. 5.* who ſaith, That before *Palladius* is coming, *Eccleſiæ abſque Epiſcopis per Monachos regebantur, minori quidem cum faſtu, & exterâ pompâ, ſed majore ſimplicitate & ſanctimoniâ.* ut all our old manuſcripts being gone, it will ot be eaſie to come to a deciſion about this natter. The *Gothick* Churches are ſaid to have een planted and conſtituted before *Ulphilas* heir firſt Biſhop came unto them for ſeventy ears together.

In the beginning the Biſhops whole charge was called παροικία, and by the ſtrain of *Ignatius* his Epiſtles, eſpecially that to *Smyrna*, it would ppear, that there was but one Church, at leaſt ut one place, where there was one Altar and Communion in each of theſe Pariſhes: for he ſaith, There was one Biſhop, one Church, and one

one Altar. And *Cyprian* phraſeth the erecting a Schiſm, by the erecting of an Altar againſt Altar: which ſeems to import, that there w but one Altar in the Biſhops Pariſh. While th number of the Chriſtians was but ſmal, the might well have all met together in one plac but as they increaſed, and the perſecutions gre upon them, they muſt have had ſeveral me ting places, and conſequently ſeveral perſons preſide and officiat in theſe meetings. But *D maſus* and *Platina* reckon, that *Evariſtus* wh was *Biſhop* of *Rome* about the 106. year, was th firſt, *qui titulos in urbe Româ Presbyteris diviſit*: that before his time, the Presbyters have all o ficiated here or there indefinitly according t the Biſhops appointment. And *Evariſtus* ſeem to have given them aſſignments to particul places. As for the meaning of the word *Titul* it is to be conſidered that the Chriſtians met bout the places where the Martyrs were buried and ſo their meeting places were called *M moriæ Martyrum*. Now upon burials ſom title or inſcription being uſually made, it foll wed that the place of the burial or graveſton was called *Titulus* among the *Latins*: ſo *Gen.* 3 20. *Jacobs* erecting a pillar upon *Rachels* grav is rendred by the vulgar *Latine*, *erexit titulum ſ per ſepulchrum*: and *Gen.* 28. 18. of *Jacobs* ſton at *Bethel*, it is ſaid, *erexit in titulum*, and 2. *Sam.* 1

8. *Abſolom* his pillar is called *Titulus*: Hence is that *Evariſtus* his dividing of the titles is to e underſtood of his giving particular aſſignents of ſeveral Churches to Presbyters.

The next thing to be examined is, what were he actions appropriated to Biſhops. If we beeve *Jerome*, the Biſhop did nothing which Preſyters might not do, except Ordination: By hich we ſee, that he judged Ordination ould not be done without the Biſhop. *Athanaus* in his ſecond *Apologie* inſerts among other apers, an Epiſtle of the *Synod* of *Alexandria*, menoning that *Iſchyras* his ordination by *Coluthus* eing queſtioned and examined, and it being ound that *Coluthus* had never been ordained a iſhop, but that he had falſlie pretended to that tle and character, all the ordinations made by im were annulled: and *Iſchyras* with ſuch oers who were ſo ordained, were declared aicks. Which is an undenyable inſtance, that that time, it was the general ſenſe of the hurch, that none but a Biſhop might ordain. Neither in any Author do we meet with an inance of any that were ordained by Presbyters, ve one, that *Caſſian*, who was about the 500. ear, *collat.* 4. *cap.* 1. gives of one *Paphnutius* a resbyter in the deſert of *Scetis*, who deligh-ing in the vertues of one *Daniel*, *ut quem vitæ meritis & gratiâ ſibi parem noverat, coæquare ſibi etiam*

etiam Sacerdotij ordine feſtinaret. ----- *Eum Presb terij honori provexit.* But what a few devout ſ litaries might do in a deſert and undiſcern corner, will be no precedent for a conſtitute Church: elſe we may allow of Baptiſm wi ſand, for that was once done in a deſert.

But *Socrates* had another opinion of this, wh *lib.* 1. *cap.* 27. tells, that *Iſchyras* did a thi πολλῶν θανατῶν ἄξιον, ὃς δὲ πώποτε γὰρ ἱερωσύνης χὼν τὸ τῦ πρεσβυτέρυ ὄνομα ἑαυτῳ περιθέμενος. A in the third Council of *Toledo*, ſet down by Gr tian, *diſt.* 23. *cap.* 14. this Canon was mad *Quorundam Clericorum dum unus ad Presbyteri duo ad Levitarum miniſterium ſacrarentur, Epiſcop oculorum dolore detentus, fertur manum ſuam ſup eos tantum impoſuiſſe, & Presbyter quidam illis co tra Eccleſiaſticum ordinem benedictionem dediſſe, ſ quia jam ille examini divino relictus, humano judi accuſari non poteſt, ij qui ſuperſunt gradum Sac dotij vel Levitici ordinis quem perverſe adepti ſu amittant.* By which we ſee how far they we from allowing of any ordination, wherein a B ſhop had not interveened.

It is further clear, that the Biſhop was lo ked upon as the Paſtor of the flock, who w πεπιστευμένος τὸν λαὸν τυ κυρίυ, and that Presb ters or Deacons could finiſh nothing, ἄνευ γν μης ἐπισκόπυ, and that he was to give an accou of the ſouls of the people: and indeed in the

da

ayes a Biſhoprick was *onus* more then *honos*. he common treaſury of the Church was alſo ommitted to his care, ſo *infra Can.* 4. And as he offerings of the faithful were layd down at he Apoſtles feet, *Acts* 4. 34. ſo were the *collectæ*, nd the other goods of the Church layd in their ands. For all the goods of the Church and *ollectæ*, were at firſt depoſitated in the Biſhops and, and diſtributed by him, though afterards there was an *Oeconomus* appointed for hat work.

Ignatius Epiſt. ad Magneſ. tells, that they ere to do nothing without their Biſhop. And *d Smyrn.* μηδεὶς χωρὶς ἐπισκόπε τι πρασσέτω τῶν ηκόντων εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. And 5. Canon of *Laodicea*, they might do nothing, ἄνευ γνώμης ἐπισκόπε. *Idem Can.* 19. *Arel.* 1.

As for Baptiſm, *Tertull. de bapt.* ſaith, *Dandi quidem jus habet ſummus Sacerdos, qui & Epiſcopus, dehinc Presbyteri & Diaconi, non quidem ſine Epiſcopi authoritate, propter Eccleſiæ bonum, quo ſalvo ſalva pax eſt, alioquin laicis etiam jus eſt. Firmilian ad Cyprianum*, which is reckoned the 75. among *Cyprian* his *Epiſtles*, ſaith, *Majores natu* (and by what is a little after, where he calls theſe Biſhops, it is clear he means not of Preſbyters) *in Eccleſiâ præſidebant, & baptizandi, & manum imponendi, & ordinandi, poteſtatem poſſidebant. Pacian. ſerm. de Bapt. Lavacro peccata*

pur-

purgantur, Chrismate spiritus super funditur, utraq
vero ista manu & ore Antistitis impetramus. An
even *Jerome* himself *contra Luciferianos*, saith
Sine Chrismate & Episcopi jussione, neque Presby
ter, neque Diaconus jus habent baptizandi. By a
which we see, that Baptism was chieflie the B
shops work, and that the Presbyters did no
baptize without his order.

As for the Eucharist, *Ignatius ad Smyrnense*
saith, ἐκείνη βεβαία εὐχαριστία ἡγείσθω, ἡ ὑπὸ ἐπι
σκόπου οὖσα, ἢ ᾧ ἄν αὐτὸς ἐπιστρέψῃ. And a little a
ter οὐκ ἔξον ἐστιν χωρὶς ἐπισκόπου βαπτίζειν οὔτε ἀγ
άπην ποιεῖν. *Justin* in his second *Apol.* giving th
account of their Eucharist and whole service
reckons all to have been managed by the προε
τῶς. And *Tert. de cor. mil. Non de aliorum qua*
præsidentium manibus sumimus. But all this is ver
unjustly applyed by such as would pretend t
the whole Ecclesiastical Authority; but woul
exempt themselves from the great labor of i
For it is clear, that according to the primitiv
constitution, the Bishop was the immediat Pasto
of the flock, & the Presbyters were assumed b
him *in partem sollicitudinis* : the greatest of th
load stil lying on his own shoulders, & this migh
have been some way managed by him, whe
the Dioceses were smaller. But the enlargin
of the Dioceses hath wholly altered the figur
of Primitive Episcopacy. All that the Bisho

ca

can now do being to try entrants well, and o-verſee theſe that are in charge; which ought not to be performed either by theſe overly viſi-tations in Synods, or by a pompous proceſſion through the Dioceſs, but by a ſtrict and ſevere examen both of their lives and labors, perfor-med in ſuch viſitations, as are ſutable to the ſim-plicity and humility of the Goſpel.

As for preaching, it was ordinary at firſt, even for perſons not ordained to preach, not to men-tion that of the *Corinthians*, where *every one brought his Pſalm, his interpretation, or his doctrine to the meeting*, which may be called extraordina-ry; under which notion, moſt reject every thing in Scripture that doth not pleaſe them. But this continued longer in the Church. *Euſeb. lib. 6. hiſt. cap.* 20. tells that *Origen* before he had got-ten the χειροτονίαν τε πρεσβυτερίε (mark how this word ſtands here for the order and degree of Presbyterat) was invited earneſtly by the Bi-ſhops not only to diſpute, but alſo to expound the Scriptures ἐν μέσῃ τῇ κοινῇ τῆς ἐκκλησίας: *In the publick aſſembly of the Church.* For the vindication where-of *Alexander* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, and *Theoctiſtus* Biſhop of *Ceſarea*, wrote to *Demetrius* Bi-ſhop of *Alexandria* thus: *Quod autem in literis adjunxeris nunquam antea auditum, neque jam uſur-patum, ut Laici præſentibus Epiſcopis diſputarent, Scripturáſve exponerent in eo mihi, neſcio quo modo,*

videris falſa dixiſſe: Nam ubi idonei & habiles re periuntur, qui fratribus in verbo DEI adjument ſint, à ſanctis Epiſcopis rogantur, ut populum DE inſtituant in verbo, ſicut Larandis Euelpis à Neone Iconij Paulinus à Celſo, & apud Synadas Theodo rus ab Attico, qui omnes beati ac pij fratres erant: a veriſimile eſt, quamvis nobis obſcurum & minim cognitum ſit, illud idem in alijs locis fieri. Tert. in hi *Apologetick cap.* 39. tells, that *Poſt aquam ma nualem & lumina, quiſquis ut de Scripturis ſancti vel de propria ingenio poteſt provocatur in medium DEO hymnum canere.* And of this remem ber what was before cited from *Hilarie* the De con on the 4. of the *Epheſians*. *Sozom. lib.* cap. 19. faith, that at *Rome* neither the Biſhop nor any other taught in the Church: but that *Alexandria* the Biſhop alone taught, that n being allowed to any Presbyter, after *Arri* broached his hereſie.

It remains only to be enquired who was t proper Miniſter of Confirmation. But becau this whole matter of Confirmation comes n in ſo properly upon any of the other Canons, ſhal therefore examine all that relates to it her & ſhal conſider upon what grounds it was uſe how early it was practiſed, with what rites was adminiſtred, who was the proper Miniſt of it, and for what end it was introduced, a continued in the Church.

Fro

From *Acts* 8. 15. and 19. 6. all the Fathers have pleaded for this rite: for there we have the laying on of hands practiſed, as a rite clearly diſtinct from Baptiſm: and though we find the holy Ghoſt conferred by that impoſition of hands, thence it will not follow that that action was extraordinary, and ſo to have expired with the Apoſtles: For we find extraordinary effects following upon their ordinary actions, ſuch as Ordination, Excommunication, &c. And yet none will plead that theſe actions are now to be diſuſed, becauſe they are no more attended with ſuch effects. But *Heb.* 6. 2. ſpeaks moſt plainly for this, where among the foundations of Religion, the laying on of hands is joyned with Baptiſms: and this ſeemed ſo clear to *Calvin* commenting on that place, that he judges this to have been a rite derived from the Apoſtles.

The conſtant ceremonie of it was that which is often mentioned in Scripture, *Impoſition of hands*. But beſides this, they began very early to uſe a *Chriſma* of conſecrated oyl, with which they anointed them in the brow. This it ſeems hath been taken from the mention that we find made of anointing, 2. *Cor.* 1. 21. where ſome think the whole rites of Confirmation are ſet down in theſe words: *Now he which ſtabliſheth us with you in* CHRIST, *and hath anointed us, is*

GOD, who hath alſo ſealed us, & given us the earneſt of the Spirit in our hearts. And 1. *John* 2. 27. we are told of *an unction from above*, and *a holy anointing*. But that in theſe words no material anointing, but the extraordinary conferring of the holy Ghoſt is meant, ſeems clear from the text; and ſo CHRIST is ſaid to be *anointed with the oyl of joy above his fellows*, though we hear nothing of a material anointing. It is true *James* 5. 14. there is clear mention made of an anointing with oyl, in which certainly there is no metaphore, but that relates nothing to our purpoſe. However, it is like from theſe places it was that the Ancients uſed the *Chriſma*, for we find that this was very early practiſed in the Church.

Theophilus Alexandrinus, who flowriſhed about the year 170. *lib. 1. ad Autolycum*, ſaith, We are for this reaſon called Chriſtians, διὰ τὸ χριόμενον ἔλαιον τοῦ θεοῦ. *Et quis mortalium eſt, qui vel ingreditur in hanc vitam, vel certat in arenâ & non oleo ungitur.* *Iren. lib.* 1. *cap.* 18. tells, That *Valentinus* uſed both *Confirmation and anointing in the receiving of his diſciples*, and tells, that *he uſed a mixture of water and oyl with Opobalſamum.* And this ſeems to imply that to have been the practiſe of the Church, for he tells, that *Valentinus* had adopted and transformed the rites of the Church into his Character. *Tert. de bap. cap.* 7. makes mention of the *Unctio benedicta*

ua egressi de lavacro perunguntur. And *cap.* 8. *deinc manus imponitur per benedictionem advocans & vitans Spiritum sanctum. Idem de resur. carnis, cap.* 8. saith, *Caro abluitur --- caro ungitur --- caro signatur, caro manus impositione adumbratur, ut & anima spiritu illuminetur.* And *lib. de præscript. cap.* 36. *Aquâ signat, Spiritu sancto vestit, Eucharistiâ pascit.* Yet *Tert. de Cor. Mil. cap.* 3. when he recounts these ceremonies which he judged to have been of Apostolical tradition, doth not reckon this for one.

Cyprian epist. 73. *ad Jubaianum*, speaking of *S. Peter* and *S. John* their laying on of hands at *Samaria*, shows it was no new Baptism: *Sed tantummodo quod deerat id à Petro & Joanne factum esse, ut oratione pro ijs habitâ, ac manu impositâ, invocaretur & infunderetur super eos Spiritus sanctus: quod nunc quoque apud nos geritur, ut qui in Ecclesiâ baptizantur præpositis Ecclesiæ offerantur, & per nostram orationem & manus impositionem Spiritum sanctum consequantur, & signaculo divino consummentur.* And *epist.* 70. after he hath spoken of Baptism, he adds, *Ungi quoque necesse est eum qui baptizatus sit, ut accepto chrismate id est unctione esse unctus Dei, & habere in se gratiam Christi possit.* And he tells, That both the Eucharist & *oleum unde unguntur baptizati, in altari sanctificatur.* *Cyril* of *Jerusalem* his third *Mistagogical Catechism* is, περὶ χρίσματος; wherein he describes

the anointing we have from GOD; and the consecrated oyl, which was the rite expressive of the former, comparing it to the dove that descended upon CHRIST, and was his spiritual anointing. Which is also done by *Optatus, lib. 4. cont. Parmenianum*, & the *Areopagite de Eccles. hier. cap.* 4. where he at length describes the rites used in the consecrating of the *Chrisma*. Yet this *Chrisma* was not so peculiar to Confirmation, but that it was also used upon other occasions. *Nazianzen* tells (as is above cited) that such as were ordained, were also anointed. It was also used in Baptism, so both *Tertullian, Cyprian*, and *Jerome*, and the 48. *Canon* of the *Council* of *Laodicea* decrees, that the *Illuminati post baptisma* should be anointed with this *unguentum cœleste*. But by the 1. *Can.* of the *Council* of *Orange*, it was decreed, *That he who was not anointed at Baptism, should receive the Chrisma at his Confirmation*: by which it seems they did not repeat the ceremonie of anointing, to such as had received it at Baptism.

Likewise these who returned from heresie, by the 7. *Can.* of the second *General Council* were to be anointed *& fronte, & oculis, & naribus, & ore, & auribus, & sigillantes eos dicimus donum Spiritus Sancti*. And like unto this is the 7. *Can.* of *Laodicea*. And *Author Resp. ad Orthod.* that goeth under *Justins* name, *ad quæst.* 14. *Cum hæreticus ad veram*

veram fidem accedit, corrigitur lapſus falſæ opinionis, ſententiæ mutatione: baptiſmi, ſancti Chriſmatis unctione; ordinationis, manuum impoſitione: nihilq; quod prius erat, indiſſolutum manet. Now by this χειροθεσία, which he mentions, is not meant a new ordination, which was not given to theſe that returned from hereſie. For as appears by the Council of *Nice*, the Orders which they got among the Hereticks were held valid, and not to be renewed: but this is meant of the ceremony ordinarly given in the abſolution and receiving of penitents. *Auguſt. cont. Donatiſt. lib. 5. cap. 23.* confeſſeth, that the Baptiſm of hereticks was valid, but denyes that they conferred the holy Ghoſt, and therefore impoſition of hands was given to thoſe who returned from hereſie.

Beſides this *Chriſma*, they uſed alſo in Confirmation the ſign of the Croſs, of which that phraſe of *Tertullian* is to be underſtood *caro ſignatur*. And *Aug. in Pſal.* 141. ſpeaking of the Sacraments, ſaith, *Quædam ſicut noſtri ore accipimus, quædam per totum corpus*. And a little after, *tegat frontem crux Domini*, which words are to be underſtood of the Euchariſt, Baptiſm & Confirmation. He calls this alſo *Sacramentum Chriſmatis, lib. 2. cont. Petilianum, cap. 104.* applying to it that of the oyntment on *Aarons* beard, *Pſal.* 133. But elſewhere he calls that bread

which was bleſt, not with the Euchariſtical and Sacramental benediction, but with that lower degree, called *Eulogiæ*, which might be given to the Catechumens, *Sacramentum Catechumenorum*; uſing this term largely, as he ſaith *Epiſt. ad Marcellinum. Signum cum ad rem ſacram applicatur, Sacramentum appellatur*. Of this ſign of the Croſs, is likewiſe to be underſtood that of the *Signaculum Dominicum*, mentioned by *Cyprian*, *Ep.* 73.

The next thing to be enquired after is, who was the Miniſter of Confirmation? In the Weſtern Church the Biſhop did only adminiſter it. So *Jerome adv. Luciferianos*, brings in the Luciferian in the Dialogue. *An neſcis Eccleſiarum hunc morem eſſe, ut baptizatis poſtea manus imponantur, & ita invocetur Spiritus ſanctus? Exigis ubi ſcriptum eſt? In Actibus Apoſtolorum. Etiamſi Scripturæ authoritas non ſubeſſet, totius orbis hanc in partem conſenſus, inſtar præcepti obtineret.* Then he makes the Orthodox to anſwer: *Non equidem abnuo hanc eſſe Eccleſiarum conſuetudinem, ut ad eos qui longe in minoribus urbibus per Presbyteros & Diaconos baptizati ſunt, Epiſcopus ad invocationem ſancti Spiritus excurrat.* And asking why the holy Ghoſt was not given, but by the Biſhop? He anſwers, That was *potius ad honorem Sacerdotij, quam ad legis neceſſitatem*. *Auguſt. de Trin. lib.* 15. *cap.* 16. ſpeaking of the Apoſtles conferring of the holy Ghoſt, ſaith, *Orabant, ut veniret Spiritus ſanctus in eos quibus manum impo-*

imponebant, non enim ipſi eum dabant, quem morem in ſuis præpoſitis etiam nunc ſervat Eccleſia.

But in the *Greek* Church, Presbyters might confirm: ſo the above cited *Hilary* on the 4. of the *Epheſ. Denique apud Ægyptum Presbyteri conſignant, ubi præſens non ſit Epiſcopus*: and *lib. quæſt. in Vet. & Nov. Teſt.* called *Auguſtine*, but believed to be the ſame *Hilaries*, *quæſt.* 101. ſaith, *In Alexandria, & per totam Ægyptum ſi deſit Epiſcopus conſecrat Preſbyter.* By the comparing of which places, it appears, that it is the ſame thing which is expreſt by theſe various names of Conſecration and Conſignation: but what is meant by it, is not agreed to. It is abſurd to think that ordination can be meant by it. For that deciſion of the caſe of *Iſchyras* ſhews that in *Alexandria* they were far from allowing Presbyters to ordain without a Biſhop. Some think that becauſe Conſecration is more uſually applyed to the bleſſing of the Euchariſt; therefore both it and Conſignation, is ſo to be underſtood here. And whereas it is objected that in the cited places ſome cuſtom peculiar to *Alexandria* ſeems to be mẽtioned; but it was univerſally allowed in the Biſhops abſence for the Presbyter to conſecrat the Euchariſt: therefore ſome other thing muſt be there meant. It is anſwered to this, that in other places Presbyters might not conſecrat *ſine Epiſcopi juſſione*; according to what was cited out of *Ignatius*; and

that

that the custom in *Alexandria* hath been, that the Presbyters without any such express mandat, might have consecrated in the Bishops absence. But the general practise of the *Greek* Church enclines me to think, that Confirmation is meant by the cited places, which was usually phrased by Consignation σφραγὶς, or σφραγισμος, only the consecrating of the *Chrisma* and oyl, was peculiar to the Bishop, as his work; so that the *Greeks* seem to have made a difference betwixt the hallowing and applying of the *Chrisma*. The first could only be done by the Bishop, but the second was not denyed to the Presbyters. Even as in the Eucharist none might consecrat but Presbyters, yet laicks of both sexes, in case of necessity, might have carried and given it to the absents.

Of Confirmation administred by Presbyters, some instances do meet us in the *Latin* Church. The first Canon of the Council of *Orange*, permits the use of the *Chrisma* to the Priests, who are appointed to carry some of it always about with them. *Conc. Epaonense, cap.* 16. permits the Presbyters to give the *Chrisma* to such hereticks as were converted on their death-beds. And the second Canon of the Council of *Orange* is: *Hæreticos in mortis discrimine positos, si Catholici esse desiderant, si Episcopus desit, à Presbyteris cum Chrismate & benedictione consignari placuit.* And

the

he Council of *Toledo* permits a Presbyter to do it in the Biſhops abſence, or in his preſence, if commanded by him. But both Eaſt and Weſt, it was agreed, that the *Chriſma* could not be ſanctified by Presbyters. *Conc. Romanum ſub Sylv. cap.* 5. decreed it. But as that Council is much ſuſpected, ſo the reaſon there given is a very poor one. *Quia Chriſtus dicitur a Chriſmate.* But Canon ſixth, *Cod. Afric.* is more authentick, *ut Chriſma à Presbyteris non fiat.* And Synod *Tolet.* Can. 20. *Quamvis pene ubique cuſtodiatur ut abſque Epiſcopo nemo Chriſma conficiat, tamen quia in aliquibus locis vel Provincijs dicuntur Presbyteri Chriſma conficere, placuit ex hoc die nullum aliud niſi Epiſcopum hoc facere.* And the *Areopagite*, as he at length deſcribes it, and deſcants upon it, ſo he appropriats it to the Biſhop.

Gregory the Great, lib. 3. *Epiſt.* 9. writing to *Januarius* Biſhop of *Caralis* in *Sardinia*, diſcharges Presbyters to anoint with the *Chriſma* on the brow, appointing that to be reſerved to the Biſhop: for *Sardinia*, and the other Iſles, had obſerved the cuſtoms of the *Greek* Church: but *Gregory Epiſt.* 26. writing to that ſame perſon, tells, that he heard how ſome were ſcandalized, becauſe he had diſcharged Presbyters the uſe of the *Chriſma*, which he therefore takes off in theſe words: *Et nos quidem ſecundum uſum veterem Eccleſiæ noſtræ fecimus, ſed ſi omnino hac de re aliqui*

aliqui contristantur, ubi Episcopi desunt, ut Presbyteri etiam in frontibus baptizatos Chrismate tangere debeant concedimus.

But 200. years afterward, *Nicolaus* first Bishop of *Rome*, observed not that moderation. For the *Bulgarians* who were converted by the *Greeks*, receiving the *Chrisma* from the Presbyters according to the custom of that Church; *Nicolaus* sent Bishops to them, and appointed such as had been confirmed by Presbyters to be confirmed again by Bishops. But upon this, *Photius*, who was then *Patriarch* of *Constantinople*, called a Synod, in which it was decreed, that the *Chrisma* being hallowed by a Bishop, might be administred by Presbyters. And *Photius* in his epistle contends, that a Presbyter might, *unguento signare, sanctificare, consummatos augere, & expiatorium donum baptizato consummare*, as well as he might either baptize or offer at the Altar. But *Nicolaus* impudently denyed, that this had ever been permitted, and upon this account it is, that many of the *Latines* have charged the *Greek* Church, as if there were no Confirmation used among them. But this challenge is denyed and rejected by the *Greeks*. And so much of the Minister of Confirmation.

It is in the last place to be considered, what value was set upon this action, and for what ends it was practised in the Church. We have alrea-

dy

dy heard *Augustin* call it a Sacrament. It is likewise so termed by *Cyprian epist.* 72. and in the records of the *Council* held by him for the rebaptizing of Hereticks. But as was marked before, they took that term largely for any holy rite or symbolical action: Whereas a Sacrament strictly taken is a holy rite instituted by Christ for a federal stipulation, by which the promises of the Gospel are sealed, and grace conveyed to the worthie receivers. Now in this sense it is visible, that Confirmation is no Sacrament: it neither being instituted by Christ, not having any grace appended to it. Neither is it so totally distinct from Baptism, being but a renovation of the Baptismal vow, joyned with prayer, and a solemn benediction.

Some have thought, that Confirmation was only used by the Ancients, as an appendix, or a consummatory rite of Baptism, which mistake is founded upon this, that some of the riper age being baptized, got this imposition of hands after Baptism. For the clearing of which some things must be considered: First, The Ancients used an imposition of hands before Baptism, to such as were admitted to be *Catechumens*, who were in the Christian Church, like the *Proselytes* of the gates among the *Jewes*: for they having renounced Idolatrie, were admitted to some parts of the Christian worship, and instru-

cted

cted in the faith for ſome time, before they could commence Chriſtians. And an impoſition of hands was uſed, when any were admitted to this order: ſo it is expreſs in the 39. Canon of *Elib.* and in the *Greek Euchologie* there is a prayer εἰς τὸ ποιῆσαι τὸν κατηχούμενον. Where it it is ſaid, *Inflat ſignat & manum imponit.* And in the Liturgie called *S. Marks*, *Quotquot ad Baptiſmum diſpoſiti eſtis accedite, ac manus impoſitionem & benedictionem accipite, dein manum imponit Sacerdos.* And *Euſeb. de vita Conſt. lib.* 4. ſaith of *Conſtantine*; *Confeſſione factâ precum particeps factus eſt per impoſitionem manuum.* The *Areopagite* makes mention alſo of this as done twice before Baptiſm; and *Aug. de mer. & remiſ. pec. lib.* 2. *cap.* 26. *Catechumenum ſecundum quendam modum ſuum per ſignum & orationem manuum impoſitionis puto ſanctificari.* And *Cyprian ad Steph.* makes Baptiſm a ſuperaddition to that impoſition of hands: which he draweſ from the example of *Cornelius*, upon whom the Spirit falling firſt, he was afterward baptized. It is true, he is there ſpeaking of ſuch as turned from hereſie, who he judged ſhould be rebaptized, after an impoſition of hands firſt given them.

But as the 39. Canon of *Elib.* ſpeaks of an impoſition of hands given before Baptiſm, ſo the 7. Canon of that ſame Council, mentions another given after it. *Si quis Diaconus regens plebem*

ſine

sine Episcopo, vel Presbyteris, aliquos baptizaverit, eos per benedictionem perficere debebit. And by the 33. Canon of that Council, any Laick that was baptized, and was no *Bigamus*, might baptize a *Catechumen* if sick. *Ita ut si supervixerit, ad Episcopum eum perducat, ut per manus impositionem perficere* (or as others read it *perfici*) *possit.* If the first be the reading, it will relate to Confirmation; if the second, it will relate to the compleating of the Baptism.

The 48. Canon of *Laodicea* is, *Illuminatos post baptisma unguento cœlesti liniendos esse.* To infer from that, that Confirmation was immediatly to follow upon Baptism is, λειτολογεῖν, for μετὰ τὸ βαπτίσμα doth not imply that it was to be done immediatly after, but only that Baptism was to go before it: and we find that same phrase in the Canons immediatly preceeding this, applyed to such as had been of a great while baptized. But though such as were of riper years had been confirmed immediatly after they received Baptism, it will no more prove that Confirmation was an appendix of Baptism, then that the Eucharist was so likewise, which was also given to them at the same time. So the *Areopagite* tells, how such as were baptized, were carried by the Priest to the Bishop. *Ille vero unguento consecrato utrum ungens sacrosanctæ Eucharistiæ participem esse pronunciat.* And though

even

even children were confirmed immediatly after Baptiſm, that doth not prove the one but a rite of the other: for we find that not only in the *African* Churches, but alſo in the *Roman* Church the cuſtom of giving children the Euchariſt immediatly after Baptiſm, continued long: for the *Ordo Romanus*, held by ſome a work of the eleventh Century, appoints, that children be permitted to eat nothing after they are baptized till they received the Euchariſt. That ſame practiſe is alſo mentioned by *Hugo the S. Victore lib. 1. cap. 20.* in the twelfth Century. And all the *Greek* Writers aſſert the neceſſity of childrens receiving the Euchariſt, and yet none aſſerted the Euchariſt to be but a rite of Baptiſm: *Cornelius* tells of *Novatian* (*apud Euſebium, lib. 6. hiſt. cap. 35.*) how he was baptized *Clinicus*, and being recovered *nec reliquorum particeps factus quæ ſecundum Canones Eccleſiæ obtinere debuerit, nec ab Epiſcopo obſignatus eſt* (It is true, it is in the *Greek* τετε σφραγισθηναι, as if it were explicative of the τα λοιπα, which in the former words he ſaid he wanted; whence ſome infer, that Confirmation was but one of the Baptiſmal rites. But it is clear that the true reading is ὑτε, and ſo *Nicephorus* hath read it) *quo non impetrato, quomodo Spiritum ſanctum obtinuiſſe putandus eſt.* Yet from the Story it appears that Confirmation was judged only neceſſary

ad

ad bene eſſe, and not to the *eſſe* of a Chriſtian; ſince notwithſtanding the want of this, *Fabian* Biſhop of *Rome* ordained *Novatian* a Presbyter.

The *Greek Euchologie* ſhews, that ſuch as were baptized, were after their baptiſm anointed, and ſo to be confirmed: and it ſubjoyning that the Euchariſt was to be given to them, proves no more the one to be a rite of Baptiſm then the other.

The whole current of the Fathers runs, that in Confirmation the holy Ghoſt was conferred. *Auguſt. de Bapt. cont. Donatiſtas, lib. 3. cap. 16. Spiritus ſanctus in ſolâ Catholicâ, per manus impoſitionem dari dicitur*, which he derives from the Apoſtles, though theſe extraordinary effects of ſpeaking of Tongues, or the like, did not follow upon it: *Sed inviſibiliter & latenter per vinculum pacis, eſt eorum cordibus charitas divina inſpirata.* And concluds, *Quid enim eſt aliud niſi oratio ſuper hominem?*

And certainly, were Confirmation reſtored according to the Apoſtolical practice, and managed with a primitive ſincerity, nothing ſhould give more probable hopes of a recovery of the Chriſtian Church, out of the darkneſs and deadneſs in which it hath continued ſo long. It might quicken perſons more ſeriouſly to conſider to what they were engaged in Baptiſm, when they were put to ſo ſolemn a renovation of it. But

the more denuded it were of all unneceſſary rites, ſuch as oyl, and the like, it might be more ſuitable to the Evangelical Spirit. And we ſee likewiſe from Antiquity, that there is no reaſon for appropriating this action wholly, or only to the Biſhop. It ſhould not be gone about till the perſon were ripe in years, and not only able by rote to recite a Catechiſm, but of a fitneſs to receive the Euchariſt immediatly after. But I ſhal conclud this whole matter with *Calvins* words, *lib. 4. Inſtit. cap. 19. §. 4. & ſequentibus* where after he hath layd out the primitive practiſe of Confirmation, he ſubjoyns: *Hæc diſciplina ſi hodie valeret, profectò parentum quorundam ignavia acueretur, qui liberorum inſtitutionem, quaſi rem nihil ad ſe pertinentem, negligunt; quam tum ſine publico dedecore omittere non poſſent. Major eſſet in populo Chriſtiano fidei conſenſus, nec tanta multorum inſcitia, & ruditas non adeo temere quidam novis, & peregrinis dogmatibus abriperentur; omnibus denique eſſet quædam velut methodus doctrinæ Chriſtianæ.*

A SUPPLEMENT ABOUT THE RURAL BISHOPS, CALLED *CHOREPISCOPI:*

IT hath been already marked, that the extent of the Dioceſſes was not all of one proportion: and generally the Villages which lay adjacent to Cities, having received the Goſpel at firſt from them, continued in ſubjection to the City; as to their mother Church: whereby the Biſhops Pariſh was not limited to the City, but did alſo include the adjacent Villages. The inſcription of *Clemens* his Epiſtles inſinuats this: Ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ παροικοῦσα Ῥώμην. Τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ παροικούσῃ Κόρινθον. By which we ſee, that the Churches of *Rome* and *Corinth* were made up not only of ſuch as inhabited the Towns, but alſo of ſuch as dwelt about them: and this is yet clearer from *Ignatius* his inſcription of his Epiſtle to the *Romans*; ἐκκλησίᾳ ἥτις προκάθηται ἐν τόπῳ χωρίου Ῥωμαίων. Neither did they judge it fit to ordain Biſhops in ſmaller or leſſer Cities, as appears by the Council of *Sardis*, Canon 6. where it is decreed, that a Biſhop

ſhould not be ordained ἐν κώμῃ τινὶ ἢ βραχείᾳ πόλει ἢ τινὶ, καὶ εἷς μόνος πρεσβύτερος ἐπαρκεῖ. Adding, that it was not neceſſary that Biſhops ſhould be ordained there, leſt the name and dignity of a Biſhop ſhould be vilipended.

But before this, it was decreed in the Council of *Laodicea*, Canon 57. ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἐν ταῖς κώμαις, καὶ ἐν ταῖς χώραις καθίστασθαι ἐπισκόπους ἀλλὰ (for ſo reads the Manuſcript of *Oxford*, *Dionyſius Exiguus*, *Iſidore Mercator*, *Herveteus*, and *Juſtellus*; and not ἤ, *vel*, as *Binius*) περιοδευτὰς: who were to do nothing without the knowledge of the Biſhop of the City. Whom the learned *Beverigius* obſerves (on this Canon) to have been diſtinct from the Rural Biſhops; which he makes out both from the Civil Law, and a place of *Gennadius*, where the Orders of Church-men being reckoned, theſe circular Viſitors are ſet in a middle rank betwixt the Rural Biſhops and Presbyters. Frequent mention is alſo made of theſe Viſitors in the Acts of the Council at *Chalcedon*. This courſe therefore they took for theſe Villages to ſend Presbyters from the City, who were called πρεσβύτεροι ἐπιχώριοι: and becauſe the Biſhop could not immediatly over-ſee them himſelf, he did therefore ſubſtitut a Vicar and Delegat who was generally called χωρεπίσκοπος. The firſt time that we meet with any of theſe, is in the beginning of the fourth Century,

in

in the Councils of *Ancyra*, *Neoceſarea*, and *Antiochia*. Theſe differed from Presbyters, in that they got an ordination diſtinct from theirs, called by the Council of *Antioch* ἡ χειροθεσία τῶν ἐπισκόπων. They alſo might have ordained *Subdeacons*, *Lectors*, and *Exorciſts*, and given them commendatory letters. But they differed from Biſhops in theſe things: Firſt, that they were ordained but by one Biſhop, as appears by the tenth Canon of the Council of *Antioch*, χωρεπίσκοπον δὲ γίνεσθαι ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἣν ὑποδέχεται ἐπισκόπε. And therefore it is that *Balſamon* calls them, τῶν ἐπισκόπων ἔξαρχεῖ. Now we have already ſeen, that a Biſhop muſt be ordained by two Biſhops at leaſt. Next, theſe χωρεπίσκοποι were ordained μὴ ἐχοντες καθέδρας ἰδίας, ſaith *Zonaras*. And therefore in their ſubſcriptions of the Councils, they only deſign themſelves *Chorepiſcopi*, without mentioning the place where they ſerved, as the Biſhops do. Now Biſhops could not be ordained but with a title to a particular charge and See. Thirdly, their power was limited, and in many things inferior to the power of Biſhops. So Pope *Leo* the firſt, in his 88. *Epiſt.* *Quamvis, cum Epiſcopis plurima illis miniſteriorum communis ſit diſpenſatio, quædam tamen Eccleſiaſticis regulis ſibi prohibita noverint, ſicut Presbyterorum & Diaconorum conſecratio.* They might in general do nothing ἄνευ γνώμης

ἐπισκόπου, and both the Council of *Ancyra*, Canon 13. And that of *Antioch*, Canon 10. diſcharge them the ordaining of Presbyters or Deacons. The words of the Council of *Antioch* are δίχα τῦ ἐπισκόπου, which words clearly import, that the Biſhop muſt have intervened in the Ordination, and ſo are wrong rendered by an old *Latine* Edition, *præter conſcientiam Epiſcopi.* As if they had been only limited not to ordain unleſs the Biſhop gave warrant. And thus theſe Biſhops of the villages and leſſer Cities were reduced from the degree of Biſhops, to an inferior and limited Office, and were undoubtedly of the Epiſcopal Order, though their authority was much abridged.

In the Council of *Neoceſarea* their relation to the Biſhop, is compared to that of the ſeventy Diſciples to the Apoſtles, and they are called Συλλειτουργοὶ. And that which is there marked as their chief work, is their care of the poor. But by the Canon of *Antioch*, they might have ordained *Lectors*, *Sub-Deacons*, and *Exorciſts*. And yet *Baſil* in his 181. *Epiſt.* ſaith, That they might not have ordained, even theſe inferior ranks, without having firſt advertiſed the Biſhop, and ſent their teſtimonies, and the ſuffrages of their election to him: Which is obſerved by *Ariſtenus* in his gloſs on the 13. Canon of *Ancyra*; and by *Matheus Blaſtares* in his *Syntagma*, *cap.* 31.

Bu

But *Damaſus*, who was about the year 370. writes his whole fourth *epiſtle* againſt them, telling that he found it decreed by his predeceſſors, that they ſhould be aboliſhed, *Prohibiti tam ab hac ſacrâ ſede, quam à totius orbis Epiſcopis. ---- Nam (ut nobis relatum eſt) quidam Epiſcoporum, propter ſuam quietem, eis plebes ſuas committere non formidant.* And falls ſeverely on theſe Biſhops, and compares them to Mercenaries & Whoors, that give out their children to others to ſuckle. He proves they were not Biſhops, becauſe not ordained by three Biſhops, and deſcants upon the Canons of *Neoceſarea* and *Antioch*, which ſeem to import, as if they had the Ordination of Biſhops; adding; *Ceſſet ergo, ceſſet tot vicibus damnata præſumptio.* And yet Pope *Leo* (as we have already cited) who was Biſhop of *Rome* about 70. years after him, makes mention of them. And notwithſtanding of all he ſaith againſt them, of their being condemned, it doth not appear when or where it was ſo done. Expreſs mention is made of them in the Council of *Nice*, Canon 8. as of a rank diſtinct from Preſbyters. It being there provided, that ſuch καθαροὶ, as returned to the unity of the Church, ſhould continue in that ſame order of the Clergie, wherein they were before, only ſuch of them as were Biſhops might not continue Biſhops of a City, where there was already a Biſhop

ſhop placed: becauſe there could not be two Biſhops in one City: but if it pleaſed the Biſhop, they might either retain the bare name of a Biſhop, or be made Chorepiſcopi, or continue among the Presbyters.

Mention alſo is made of them in the 2. Canon of the general Council of *Chalcedon*, which ſhews, that at that time they were not wholly taken away: but the lateſt accounts we have of them is in *France*, where it ſeems they continued longeſt. *Conc. Pariſ. anno* 829. they are *cap.* 27. compared to the 70. diſciples, according to that of *Neocesarea*, and Biſhops are appointed to ſee that they did nothing beyond what was permitted to them by the Canons. The like is decreed *Conc. Meldenſi anno* 845. *cap.* 44. And it is expreſſed there, that they might neither give the holy *Chriſma*, nor the holy Ghoſt, nor confer any order above that of a Subdeacon, nor conſecrat Churches. *Conc. Metenſi, anno* 888. *cap.* 5. It was decreed, That Churches conſecrated by them were to be again conſecrated by a Biſhop, and any thing they did which was proper to a *Biſhop* was declared null, and they are reckoned all one with Presbyters; and here we looſe ſight of them, hearing no more of them: for as they aroſe inſenſibly, ſo they evaniſhed in the like faſhion. So much of them and upon the firſt Canon.

THE

THE SECOND CANON.

Πρεσβύτερος ὑπὸ ἑνὸς ἐπισκόπου χειροτονείσθω καὶ διάκονος, καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ κληρικοί.

A Presbyter ſhal be ordained by one Biſhop, ſo likewiſe a Deacon, and the reſt of the Clergie.

WE find moſt of the Fathers, even *Jerome* himſelf, drawing the ſubordination among Church-men from what was under the Law; and therefore Deacons were ordinarily called *Levits*. But there is more ground to think, it was immediatly taken from the form of the Synagogue, though that conſtitution might have had its riſe from the model of the Temple-ſervice. I ſhal not here engage in a large examen of the firſt origine and riſe of the Synagogues, or of the worſhip performed in them, or debate whether they began before

before the captivity, in it, or after it. Nor what ground there may be from the word *Synagogue* uſed *Pſal.* 74. 8. to aſſert their early date. But certain it is, that the Temple-Worſhip was meerly typical, in which the whole people were to aſſiſt, but at a few returns of the year. And beſide this, the Law of nature dictats, that GOD is to be frequently and ſolemnly worſhipped by ſuch as acknowledge his great Name, which will plead for an early riſe to theſe Aſſemblies.

But be in that what may be, two things are certain. The one is, that Synagogues were conſtitute in our Saviors time, and that there were Rulers, and chief Rulers in theſe Synagogues, that in them prayers were ſaid, the Law was read, expounded, and exhortations made upon it, and Diſcipline was uſed, and ſuch as were faulty were caſt out of theſe Synagogues. All this is evident from the New Teſtament: and much more then this can be gathered out of *Jewiſh* writings. Now our Saviors going into theſe Synagogues, reading the Law, and preaching in them, doth abundantly evince, that this conſtitution was not unlawful.

Another thing is as clear from the Old Teſtament, that there was neither written command, nor warrant for ſuch Aſſemblies; and the contrary of this none can undertake to make out.

From

From which poſitions, both of them equally clear and certain, a great ſtep might be made for the calming and compoſing of debates about Government, were heats and prejudices out of the way. It being apparent, that there was an entire frame of Church-Government, and worſhip among the *Jews*, which was not unlawful, though not of divine inſtitution.

In the Synagogues there was (as is marked before) firſt, one that was called the Biſhop of the Congregation. Next, the three Orderers, & Judges of every thing about the Synagogue, who were called *Tſekenim*, and by the *Greeks* πρεσβύτεροι, or γέροντες. Theſe ordered and determined every thing that concerned the Synagogues, or the perſons in it, Next them, were the three *Parnaſſin* or Deacons, whoſe charge was to gather the collections of the rich, and to diſtribute them to the poor: And theſe were called *Septem viri boni Civitatis*. The term *Elder*, was generally given to all their Judges: but chiefly to theſe of the great *Sanhedrin*, ſo we have it *Matth.* 16. 21. *Mark* 8. 31. 14. 43. and 15. 1. And *Acts* 23. 14. And for a fuller ſatisfaction to this, I muſt refer you to ſuch as have given an account of the Synagogue out of the *Jewiſh* Writers.

Next, a great deal might be ſaid, to prove that the Apoſtles in their firſt conſtitutions, took things

things as they had them modelled to their hand in the Synagogue: and this they did, both becauſe it was not their deſign to innovate, except where the nature of the Goſpel Diſpenſation obliged them to it. As alſo, becauſe they took all means poſſible to gain the *Jews*, who we find were zealous adherers to the traditions of their Fathers, and not eaſily weaned from theſe precepts of *Moſes*, which by CHRISTS death were evacuated: and if the Apoſtles went ſo great a length in complying with them in greater matters, as circumciſion, and other legal obſervances, (which appears from the *Acts* and *Epiſtles*) we have good grounds to ſuppoſe, that they would have yeelded to them in what was more innocent and leſs important. Beſides, there appears both in our LORD himſelf, & in his Apoſtles, a great inclination to ſymbolize with them, as far as was poſſible. Now the nature of the Chriſtian Worſhip ſhows evidently, that it came in the room of the Synagogue, which was moral, and not of the Temple-Worſhip, which was typical and ceremonial. Likewiſe, this parity of cuſtoms betwixt the *Jews* and Chriſtians, was ſuch, that it made them be taken by the *Romans*, and other more overly obſervers, for one ſect of Religion: and finally, any that will impartially read the New Teſtament, will find, that when the forms of Govern-

Government, or Worſhip are treated of, it is not done with ſuch architectonical exactneſs, as was neceſſary, if a new thing had been inſtituted, which we find practiſed by *Moſes*. But the Apoſtles rather ſpeak, as theſe who give rules for the ordering, and directing of what was already in being. From all which it ſeems well grounded and rational to aſſume, that the firſt conſtitution of the Chriſtian Churches, was taken from the model of the Synagogue, in which theſe Elders were ſeparated, for the diſcharge of their imployment, by an impoſition of hands, as all *Jewiſh* Writers do clearly witneſs.

So the Presbyters of the Christian Church were ordained by an imposition of hands. Their power was not only to preach, which (as I showed already) was common to others, but also to administer Sacraments; so that it is true which *Jerome* saith, *Communi consilio Presbyterorum res gerebantur.*

We have already considered, how necessary it was judged, that no Ordination of Presbyters might be gone about without the presence and concurrence of the Bishop, as the principal person, which was judged necessary (as I suppose) more upon the account of Unity and Order, then from the nature of the thing in its self: for taking things in themselves, it will follow, that

what-

whatever power one hath, he may tranſmit to another; and therefore there ſeems to be ſmal reaſon, why one who hath the power of preaching the Goſpel, and adminiſtring Sacraments, may not alſo tranſmit the ſame to others: and it ſeems unreaſonable ſo to appropriat this to a Biſhop, as to annull theſe Ordinations which were managed by Presbyters, where Biſhops could not be had. *Maimonides* ſaith, *Every one regularly ordained, hath power to ordain his diſciples alſo.*

There remains nothing to be cleared about this from Antiquity, ſave the 13. Canon of the Council of *Ancyra*, which runs thus. Χωρεπισκόποις μὴ ἐξεῖναι πρεσβυτέρους ἢ διακόνους χειροτονεῖν ἀλλὰ μηδὲ πρεσβυτέροις, (others read πρεσβυτέρους) πόλεως χωρὶς τῦ ἐπιτραπῆναι ὑπὸ τῦ ἐπισκόπου μετὰ γραμμάτων ἐν ἑτέρᾳ παροικίᾳ. Others read ἑκάστῃ παροικίᾳ.

Now the difficulty raiſed about this Canon is this, that if the reading be ἑκάστῃ and πρεσβυτέροις, then it will follow, that the Presbyters of the City might have ordained without the Biſhops preſence, if they had his warrant in writing. Yea, they alſo infer, that it is probable that before that, they ordained even without the Biſhops warrant, to which they were limited by this Canon: and upon this *Wallo Meſſalinus* triumphs not a little. But *Blondel* chooſed

ra-

ther to read the Canon πρεσβυτέρους; as if the eaning of it were, that the *Chorepiſcopi* could ot have ordained either Presbyters or Deacons; nor the Presbyters of the City without he Biſhops warrant in writing; which will infer, that they might have done it being ſo warranted. It is true, *Binius* hath read it ſo; ſo alſo hath *Gentianus Hervetus*, as appears by his *Latin* verſion of this Council. The *Arabick Manuſcript* alſo favors this. And it is directly aſſerted by *Zonaras* on this Canon, and *Ariſtenus*.

But it is contradicted by the whole tract of Antiquity, whom we find all concurring in this, that the *Chorepiſcopi* might neither ordain Preſbyters, nor Deacons without a Bishop, as was cleared in its due place. But for that of *Wallo Meſſalinus*, it will appear to be ill grounded: For firſt, it is certain that the *Chorepiſcopi* were a dignity above Presbyters. It will be therefore unreaſonable to think that Presbyters could do that which was unlawful to the other. Beſides, how bad an inference is it from one Canon of a Provincial Council, of which there are ſuch various readings, to argue for a thing which is not only without any other ground, but alſo contrary to the whole current of Antiquity? And it was but few years after this, that in *Alexandria* the Ordinations given by *Coluthus*, who

was

was but a Presbyter, and only φαντάσθεις τὸ ἐπίσκοπον, were annulled. Now *Ancyra* being in *Aſia* the leſſer, and diverſe Bishops out of *Syria* being there, in particular the Bishops of *Antioch* and *Ceſarea*, who ſubſcribed firſt; how came it that there was no notice of this had at *Alexandria*, to have prevented their ſevere ſentence in the caſe of *Colluthus*?

But to conſider the readings of the Canon *Binius* reads it ἑτέρᾳ, ſo *Juſtellus*: it is true, he hath on the margin (*aliter* ἑκάστῃ) *Hervetus* hath tranſlated it, *in alienâ Parochia*. Now if this be the true reading, the meaning of it will run thus. Whereas by a great many other Canons Presbyters were ſo tyed to their Biſhop, that no Biſhop was to receive the Presbyter of another Biſhop, without his Biſhops warrant and licence, and his *literæ paſſivæ*, and *dimiſſoriæ*. So here the Presbyters of the City are diſcharged to go and aſſiſt at Ordinations, in other Pariſhes without a written licence from their own Biſhop.

But as this Canon is read (ἑκάστῃ) by ſome ſo they ſeem to have added to it, μηδὲν πρᾶττειν or μηδὲν κελεύειν; ſo that the meaning of it is that the Presbyters of the City might do nothing without the Biſhops warrant and licence in writing: Thus have both *Iſidorus Mercator*, & *Dionyſius Exiguus* read it, as appears by their *Latin* verſion

verſions which are, *Sed nec Presbyteris civitatis (licet) ſine Epiſcopi præcepto, aliquid amplius imperare, vel ſine authoritate literarum ejus, in unaquaque Parochiâ aliquid agere.* And this is according to *Binius* his edition of them. But in another edition of *Dionyſius Exiguus* by *Juſtellus*, he ſeems to have read it ſimply ἑκάστῃ, without any ſupplement.

Another old *Latin* edition publiſhed by *Juſtellus* hath, *Sed neque Presbyteris civitatis licere, ſine juſſione Epiſcopi, ſed cum ejuſdem literis eunds ad ſingulas Parochias.* *Joannes Antiochenus* in his *Collectio Canonum*, reads it ſimply ἑκάστῃ παροικίᾳ. *Ferrandus* in his *breviatio Canonum*, Canon 92. cites this part of the Canon thus: *Ut Presbyteri civitatis, ſine juſſu Epiſcopi, nihil jubeant, nec in unaquaque Paræciâ aliquid agant.* *Alexius Ariſtinus* in his *Synopſis*, hath the firſt part of the Canon, but wants the ſecond part. (And in his Gloſs agrees with *Zonaras*, as was before obſerved.) And ſo doth *Simeon Logotheta*, in his *Epitome Canonum*. And by this diverſity of reading, it will appear how little ground there is for founding any thing upon this Canon alone, eſpecially when that alledged from it, is contradicted by undeniable evidences.

But as Presbyters might not ordain without Biſhops, ſo neither could Biſhops ordain without the advice, conſent, and concurrence of

their Presbyters *Conc. Carth.* 4. *Canon* 22. *Ut Epiſcopus, ſine concilio Clericorum ſuorum, Clericos non ordinet, ita ut civium teſtimonium & conniventiam quærat.* And it was laid to *Chryſoſtome* his charge ἔτι ἀνευ᾽ συνεδρίου καὶ παρα γνώμης τῦ πλήθους ποιεῖται τας χειροτονίας. And in the *Roman Council* held by *Sylveſter* (if credit be due to the Registers of that Council, which are indeed juſtly queſtionable) it was decreed, *cap.* 11. that one was to be ordained a Presbyter, *cum omnes Presbyteri declararent & firmarent, & ſic ad ordinem Presbyterij accederet.* And none was to be made Biſhop, *niſi omnis Clerus expeteret uno voto perenni.*

It is likewiſe certain, that all things were done by the joynt advice of Biſhop and Presbyters. Neither were theſe wretched conteſts, of the limits of Power, much thought on, or to ſed among them. The Biſhops pretending to more, then Presbyters were willing to yeeld them; and Presbyters claiming no more, the Biſhops were ready to allow them. Their contentiõs lay chiefly with theſe that were without thoſe inteſtine fewds, and broils being reſerved for our unhappy dayes.

But as we find *Cyprian* amply declaring, he he reſolved to do nothing without the conſe of his Clergy, and people: ſo in the *Afric* Churches that courſe continued longeſt

vig

igor. Diverſe inſtances whereof appear in the . *Council* of *Carthage*, one I have already cited, o which I ſhal add three more, *Can.* 23. *Epiſ-opus nullius cauſam audiat, abſque præſentiâ Cle-icorum ſuorum, alioquin irrita erit ſententia Epiſco-i, niſi Clericorum præſentiâ confirmetur. Can.* 34. *Epiſcopus in quolibet loco ſedens, ſtare Presbyterum on patiatur.* And *Can.* 35. *Epiſcopus in Eccleſiâ, in conſeſſu Presbyterorum, ſublimior ſedeat; intra omnium vero, collegam Presbyterorum ſeſe eſſe cog-ſcat.*

There were two ranks of Presbyters, as clear-y appears from the 15. Canon of *Neoceſarea*, o wit, the Presbyters of the City, and the Preſ-yters of the Countrey. The former were the ore eminent, in ſo far that the latter might ot conſecrate the Euchariſt within the Church f the City in their preſence, which appears rom the cited Canon. Over the Presbyters of he Countrey were the *Chorepiſcopi*, of whom al-eady: but the Presbyters of the City being ext at hand, were the Biſhops Counſel, and ad-iſers in all matters. The Biſhop and they had he overſight of the ſouls within the City. They ere alſo to be maintained out of the Treaſury f the Church, and were called *Canonici* or *Præ-endarij*. The reaſon why they were called *Ca-onici*, was either, becauſe of their regular ob-erving of the courſe of Worſhip, and hours of

Prayer: or becauſe of the diſtributions that wer
made among them, according to the Canon o
Rule, and from the ſhare that was aſſigned t
them, called *Præbenda*, they got the name *Pr*
bendarij.

This *Conſeſſus* or *Collegium Presbyterorum*, wa
afterwards deſigned by the barbarous word C
pitulum. The chief over them, or the *Vice præſ*
next to the Biſhop was called *Archipresbyter*, o
Decanus, *Idem quod decurio*, *qui decem milit*
præerat: And inſenſibly the whole Eccleſiaſtic
Juriſdiction crept into their hands. The Pre
byters of the Countrey either neglecting it, e
being neglected in it. But without the *Capit*
lum, nothing that the Biſhop did was valid.

However, when the firſt fervor and vigor o
Church-Diſcipline ſlakened: avarice and amb
tion creeping in apace into the hearts o
Church-men, theſe *Chanoins* or *Prebends* n
contented with their allowances out of th
Church of the City, which were too ſmal fo
their growing deſires, got Churches in th
Countrey annexed to them: and for moſt pa
ſerved them by ſubſtituts, except at the retu
of ſome ſolemn feſtivities: and by this means
was, that Church-Diſcipline fell totally into th
Biſhops hands; and the ancient model being la
aſide, new courts which were unknown to An
tiquity, were ſet up. As theſe of the *Arch-de*

co

ons, *Chancellors*, *Officials*, *Surrogats*, &c. However the *Prebends*, though they had deſerted their intereſt in Church-Diſcipline, yet two things they ſtuck to, becauſe of the advantage and power that followed them.

The one was the Capitular Elections of the Biſhop, and the other was the medling with, and diſpoſing of the Church revenues, and treaſure. But it was a groſs contradiction to the ends of Government, that the Biſhop alone might manage the Spiritual part of his charge, but muſt be limited to the advice of his Presbyters for the governing of the temporality. Yet this was a further proof of that ſaying, *Religio peperit divitias, & filia devoravit matrem.* And thus far we have ſeen what intereſt Presbyters had within their own Pariſh (mark that at firſt the Biſhops precinct was called *Pariſh*, and not *Dioceſs*) neither was the meeting of the Biſhop with his Presbyters called a Synod: by which we ſee how weak that alledgeance is, that there were no *Dioceſan Biſhops* in the firſt Centuries, being meerly a playing with the word *Dioceſs*.

But let us next conſider what intereſt *Presbyters* had in *Provincial* or *National Councils*. If that of the *Acts* 15. was a Synod, in it we have *Presbyters* ſubſcribing with the Apoſtles. *Brethren* are alſo there added, not as if there had

been any Laiks elected out of the Laity, ſuch a theſe are who are now vulgarly called *Lay-El ders*, but ſome more eminent Chriſtians, whom as the Apoſtles called then, ſo the Biſhops conti nued afterward to conſult and adviſe with i Eccleſiaſtick matters. But that Presbyters ſat in Provincial Synods in the firſt and purer ages, is undeniably clear. When *Victor* held th Council at *Rome* about the day of Eaſter, *Dama ſus* tells that it was *collatione facta cum Presbyter & Diaconibus.* Likewiſe in the Council that *Cy prian* held, about the rebaptizing of Heretick there were preſent, *Epiſcopi plurimi ex provinci Africanâ, Numidiâ, Mauritaniâ, cum Presby teris & Diaconibus, præſente etiam plebis maxim parte.* And his contemporary *Firmilian*, who Epiſtle is the 75. among *Cyprians*, tells us, ho there were yearly Synods of Biſhops and Pre byters, *Quâ ex cauſâ*, ſaith he, *neceſſario apud n ſit, ut per ſingulos annos ſeniores & Presbyteri,* (which it is clear, that he can mean none, b Presbyters and Biſhops) *in unum conveniamu ad diſponenda ea, quæ curæ noſtræ commiſſa ſunt.*

Euſebius lib. 6. *cap.* 35. tells, That upon t account of *Novatus* his ſchiſm, there was held *Rome* σύνοδος μέγιστη, which conſiſted of ſix Biſhops, and many more Presbyters, and D cons, πλειόνων δ' ἔτι μᾶλλον πρεσβυτέρων, καὶ δ κόνων. He likewiſe tells *lib.* 7. *cap.* 27. H

t

that upon *Samoſatenus* his hereſie, there was a great Synod held in *Antioch*: and after he hath ſet down the names of ſome Biſhops there preſent, he adds, that there were μυρίοι τε ἄλλοι σὺν πρεσβυτέροις, καὶ διακόνοις. And their Synodal letter is written in the name of the Biſhops, Presbyters and Deacons.

In the Council of *Eliberis* in *Spain*, there were 19. Biſhops, *reſidentibus triginta ſex Presbyteris, adſtantibus Diaconibus & omni plebe.* In the Provincial Council at *Arles*, which judged in the matter of *Donatus* his ſchiſm, *Conſtantin* the Emperor being preſent, where were about two hundred Biſhops from diverſe Nations, from *Italy*, *France*, *Spain*, *Sicily*, *Sardinia*, *Africk*, *Numidia*, and *Britain*, the Canons of that Council are ſubſcribed by many Presbyters and Deacons. And if the ſtory of the Council of *Rome* under *Sylveſter* be true, it is ſubſcribed by 284. Biſhops, 45. Presbyters, and 5. Deacons. Now all theſe being before the Council of *Nice*, evince that in the firſt and beſt ages, Presbyters voted and judged in Provincial Councils, and if in Provincials, why not in General ones?

The Council of *Nice* is ſubſcribed by ſome *Chorepiſcopi*, and one *Chorepiſcopus* ſubſcribes in the Council of *Epheſus*. And if *Chorepiſcopi* be (as it is the opinion of ſome) in their natural dignity only Presbyters, then we have Presby-

ters alſo ſubſcribing General Councils. Beſides that in the Council of *Conſtantinople*, and *Epheſus*, diverſe Biſhops ſubſcribed by Presbyters; from all which it is clear, that there is no ground from Antiquity to exclude Presbyters from a ſuffrage in National & General Councils: & it is but a frivolous diſtinction that they may have a conſultative, though not a deliberative ſuffrage, ſince we ſee them ſubſcribing both the deciſions of faith and Canons of Diſcipline.

The next thing to be examined, is the qualification, election, and ordination of Presbyters. For their qualification, great care was uſed to train them up long in an abſtracted and devote life, that ſo they might be well prepared for that holy function. And therefore it was that many of the Primitive Biſhops lived in Monaſteries among them, whom they were educating for holy Orders, as appears from the lives of *Baſil*, *Auguſtin*, and *Martin*: Neither was one to be ordained a Presbyter, but after a long probation and tryal, and all theſe degrees, of which we ſhal ſpeak afterward, were ſo many ſteps & preparations through which all were to go, before they could be initiated. And indeed it ſeems againſt reaſon, at firſt ſtep to ordain a man Presbyter, & commit the care of ſouls to him, before a long previous probation had of him.

Therefore the ancient Monaſteries, as they were

were Sanctuaries for ſuch as deſigned to leave the world, and live devoutly, ſo they were alſo Colledges for the education of Church-men. It is true, the years of probation may ſeem too too many; but they ordinarly diſpenſed in that, as they found perſons worthy and qualified. But none might be Presbyter before he were thirty years of age, according to the Council of *Neoceſarea*, even though he were highly worthy (πάνυ ἄξιος.) And the reaſon given for this, is, becauſe CHRIST was thirty years of age before he entred upon the diſcharge of his holy function.

Likewiſe a *Clinicus*, that is, one baptized in ſickneſs, by the twelfth Canon of *Neoceſarea*, could not have been a Presbyter, becauſe he was not a Chriſtian, ἐκ προαιρέσεως ἀλλ' ἐξ ἀνάγκης. And this was not to be diſpenſed with, but upon his following faith and diligence, or that others could not be had.

And in the *Canon Law*, *diſt. 77. cap. Siquis*, among other prerequiſits for a Presbyter, one is: *Si pœnitentiam publicam non geſſerit*, holding that any groſs ſcandal committed after Baptiſm, ſhould be a bar upon a man from being ordained a Presbyter.

As alſo *Diſt. 56. cap. 1.* the children of Preſbyters are diſcharged to be ordained: *Presbyterorum filios à ſacris altaris miniſterijs removemus, niſi aut in Cœnobijs, aut in Canonicis religioſe probati fuerint*

fuerint converſari. It is like, this was either to diſcourage the marriage of Church-men, or to obviat the ſcandal might have been taken, if they had been partial to their own children. Yet this was neither old nor univerſal; for *Nazianzen* was both a Presbyter and a Biſhop, though a Biſhops ſon. And in the next Chapter of that ſame *Diſt.* many inſtances are alledged by *Damaſus* to the contrary.

Further, none who had been ſouldiers, and were *Curiales*, and *obſtricti curiæ*, could have been ordained without a dimiſſion, and that they had been fifteen years in a Monaſtery, and three parts of four of their eſtat were adjudged to the fisk; *Diſt.* 53. and *Juſtinian* 123. *Nov.* Now this might be firſt, leſt any weary of the ſervice to which they were obliged, ſhould upon that pretence ſhake it off, and run from their colors, or other employments. But next, that men who had been much involved in the world, and particularly men of blood, might not enter into holy Orders, without a long precedent change of the courſe of their life; it not being eaſie to paſs of a ſudden from a courſe of ſecularity, to that ſublimity of holineſs which is neceſſary for ſuch a ſacred function.

And finally, all *ambitus* was condemned in Presbyters, as well as in Biſhops; though we ſee both from *Chryſoſtoms* books *de Sacerdotio*, and *Nazian-*

Nazianzens Apologetick, that there was enough of it among both kinds. Yet many there were who reſiſted the calls given them to Church-Offices with great earneſtneſs, ſome flying from them to the wilderneſs, as from a perſecution: ſome cutting off their noſes, and other members, that they might be thought unworthy of it; ſome continued to the end in their refuſal; others were not ordained without being haled even by force; many receiving this ſacred impoſition of hands with trembling and many tears. And indeed were the greatneſs of the charge more weighed, and the ſecular advantages leſs looked at, it is like there might be yet need of ſome force to draw men to accept of it; whereas all are ſo forward to ruſh toward it, blown up with pride, or provoked by covetouſneſs.

We ſaw already how averſe *Nazianzen* was from entring in ſacred Orders: but no leſs memorable is the Hiſtory of *Chryſoſtome*, who (with his friend *Baſil*) having engaged in a Monaſtick life, was ſtruck with fear when a rumor roſe that they were both to be ordained Preſbyters. (And by the way obſerve, that he calls it τὸ ἐπισκοπῆς ἀξίωμα.) But *Chryſoſtome* was ſilent, leſt the expreſſing of his averſion ſhould have deterred *Baſil*; and this his ſilence was judged by *Baſil* a conſent, and ſo proved one of his chief

chief inducements to accept of Orders. But when the day came wherein *Chryſoſtome* knew that the Biſhops deſigned to ordain them, he withdrew privatly, ſo that he could not be found: yet the Biſhops upon another pretence, carryed *Baſil* to the Church, and there ordained him, much againſt his mind.

But when he firſt met with his friend *Chryſoſtome*, he melted down in tears, challenging him ſeverely for his withdrawing from him; whereof *Chryſoſtome* gives his Apology at large in theſe ſix excellent Books of his *de Sacerdotio*; wherein by way of Dialogue betwixt him and his friend, he layeth out the great dignity and weight of that charge, chiefly in the third Book, where he ſhows, *That a Prieſt ſhould be like one of the Angels of GOD, cap.* 4. And he blames theſe elections that were raſhly made, *cap.* 10. upon which he charges moſt of the diſorders that were then in the Church. And *cap.* 11. he confeſſeth how guilty himſelf was of that unlawful *ambitus* for Church employment; which being yet unmortified in him, did frighten him from entring in holy Orders. *Cap.* 14. he ſaith, *Epiſcopum convenit ſtudio acri & perpetuâ vitæ continentia tanquam adamantinis armis obſeptum eſſe.* In the fourth Book he ſpeaks of the great caution was to be uſed in Elections and Ordinations, complaining that in theſe, *Regard was rather had*

to riches and honor, then true worth. Through the fifth Book he ſhows the great evil and hazard of popular applauſe, and the ſin of being much pleaſed with it. And *lib. 6. cap. 2.* he hath that excellent ſaying, *That the ſoul of the Prieſt ſhould be purer then the very beams of the Sun themſelves.* Καὶ γὰρ τῶν ἀκτίνων αὐτῶν καθαρωτέραν τῷ ἱερεῖ τὴν ψυχὴν εἶναι δεῖ. And *cap. 12.* he accuſes himſelf of his vain deſires and other faults, whence it was that he had ſo great a horror of attempting at that for which he knew himſelf ſo unworthy: preoccupying that objection, that a man in that is to ſubmit to the judgement of others, by the examples of one who hath no skil in Phyſick, and knowing himſelf ignorant, is not to adminiſter Phyſick, though all the world ſhould deſire him to undertake a cure, declaring their opinion and confidence of his skill: for if upon another mans opinion of his skil he ſhould offer to medle in it, and give Phyſick, he might as well kill as cure. So neither one unacquainted in military affaires, was to undertake the leading of an army, knowing his own unfitneſs, though never ſo much ſolicited to it: whence he ſubſumes more ſtrongly, that none ſhould undertake the leading of ſouls, as long as he knew his own unfitneſs, were the importunities and ſolicitations of others never ſo many. And ſo far of the qualifications of

thoſe

thoſe who were to be ordained Presbyters.

Their election hath been touched already, for it went the ſame way with the elections of Biſhops, and ſo was partly popular, at leaſt was to be ratified by the approbation, and conſent of the people. *Poſſidius in vita Auguſtini*, tells how he was choſen a Presbyter by the people.

We have the Ordination of the Presbyters ſet down thus, *Conc. Carth.* 4. *Canon* 3. *Presbyter quum ordinatur, Epiſcopo eum benedicente, & manum ſuper caput ejus tenente, etiam omnes Presbyteri, qui præſentes ſunt, manus ſuas juxta manum Epiſcopi ſuper caput illius teneant.* *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite* in the fore cited place tells, That the Preſbyter whom he calls ἱερεὺς, was ordained in the ſame form that a Biſhop was ordained, ſave only that the Goſpel was not laid on his head. From which ſimplicity of the primitive formes, we may ſee, how far they were from all theſe ſuperſtitious fopperies now uſed in the *Romiſh Church* in ordination. And ſo much concerning Presbyters.

Deacons are next to be treated of. The original of them is by the general current of the Ancients taken from the *Levits* under the Temple, and therefore in not a few of the ancient Councils, they go under that deſignation. But as was formerly obſerved, it is more probable, that the Chriſtian Church took its immediat model

from

from the Synagogue, though that might have been taken from the Temple. Now in the Synagogue, as there was a Biſhop and Presbyters, ſo there were alſo Deacons called *Parnaſin*. There were three of them in each Synagogue, two were to gather the collections, and all the three together did diſtribute them.

The firſt origine of them in the Chriſtian Church is ſet down, *Acts* 6. where their primitive inſtitution ſhews, that their firſt deſign was for looking to the neceſſities of the poor, who had been neglected in the dayly diſtribution of the charity, and there they are called διάκονοι. It is true, that term *Luke* 4. 20. is uſed in another ſenſe, for there the *Miniſter of the Synagogue*, to whom CHRIST delivered the book, could be no other, then their *Chazan* or Biſhop, whoſe office it was to call out any to read the Law in the Synagogue. But ſince all Church-Office is for ſervice, and not for domination, Chriſt himſelf not coming *to be miniſtred unto, but to miniſter*, it is no wonder, if that term ſhould then have been promiſcuouſly uſed. We alſo find *S. Paul* applying to himſelf (1. *Cor.* 4. a term equivalent to this.) But though the primitive inſtitution of Deacons import only their looking to the neceſſities of the poor: yet from the *Levites* miniſtring to the Prieſt in the ſacrifices, it came to be generally received and uſed,

that

that Deacons ſhould ſerve the Biſhops and Presbyters in the adminiſtration of the Sacraments.

The inſtitution of them doth alſo diſcover, that they were perſons to be ſeparated for that holy ſervice, and conſecrated for it by an impoſition of hands; and ſo were to be no more ſecular, but Eccleſiaſtical perſons: and the uſual practiſe of the Church was to account that office a ſtep, degree and probation, in order to ones being made a Presbyter. And therefore our mungrel *Lay-Deacons* differ vaſtly, both from the firſt inſtitution of the Scripture, and current of all Antiquity.

The *Areopagite* gives the account of their ordinations thus: *That the Deacon being brought to the Biſhop, kneeled down on one knee, and ſo received impoſition of hands.* The fourth Canon of the fourth Council of *Carthage* is: *Diaconus quum ordinatur, ſolus Epiſcopus, qui eum benedicit, manum ſuper caput illius ponat; quia non ad Sacerdotium, ſed ad miniſterium conſecratur.*

As for their Election, at the firſt inſtitution they were choſen by the whole body of the people, ſo *Acts* 6. And though the people were barred their ſuffrage in the choyce of other Church-Officers, yet there might be good reaſon why they ſhould ſtill chooſe the Deacons, their Office being almoſt wholly temporal, to receive

receive and diſtribute the peoples alms. But whatever right people might pretend to in this, it will never be proved that by divine right, the people ſhould chooſe thoſe who had the charge of their ſouls. For reaſon would infer, that none could make a choice, who were not able to give a judgement of the qualifications, and worth of a Church-man, that being peculiar to the Clergy. And hence it is that more then a conſent cannot be juſtly pretended to by the people. But after all this, if this place prove any thing, it will prove in favors of the whole body of the people, and not of a few ſelected *Lay-Elders*.

All the Deacons were in their degree and order, inferior to Presbyters, which will appear from theſe Canons of the 4. *Council of Carthage*, Canon 37. *The Deacon is declared to be the Miniſter of the Presbyter, as well as of the Biſhop.* Canon 39. *He might ſit in the preſence of a Presbyter, if deſired by him.* Canon 40. *In conventu Presbyterorum Diaconus interrogatus, loquatur;* ſo that he might not ſpeak, except deſired. It is therefore a diſorder in Church-Diſcipline, that the Arch-Deacon ſhould not only be a Presbyter, but alſo exerciſe Juriſdiction over Presbyters. And therefore *Petrus Bleſenſis, Epiſt.* 123. hath well obſerved, how *turbato ordine dignitatis, Archidiaconi hodie Sacerdotibus præeminent, & in eos vim ac poteſtatem ſuæ Juriſdictionis exercent.*

Jerome is the firſt that makes mention of theſe Archdeacons, telling how the Deacons did chooſe one of their number to be over them, *quem Archidiaconum vocabant*: and in the ſame epiſtle to *Evagrius*, he ſeverely inveighs againſt thoſe Deacons, who pretend to an equality with, or preference over Presbyters, ſaying: *Quid patitur menſarum & viduarum Miniſter, ut ſupra eos tumidus ſeſe efferat, ad quorum preces corpus ſanguiſque Chriſti conficitur.*

Becauſe of the firſt number, *Seven*, the cuſtom was to have but ſeven Deacons in a City were it never ſo great: ſo it was decreed in the Council of *Neoceſarea* 14. Canon. Their office was chiefly to look to the poor, and to ſerve in the adminiſtration of the Sacraments. *Juſtin Martyr* in the end of his ſecond *Apologie* tells, That the *Euchariſt was ſent by the Deacons to ſuch as were abſent. Cyprian lib. 3. epiſt.* 15. reckons it as a part of the Deacons Office *to wait upon the Martyrs*, & *epiſt.* 17. of that ſame book, he tells, That where there was no Presbyter, *& urgere exitus cœperit. The Deacon might receive the Exhomologeſis of penitents, and abſolve them by impoſition of hands. Optatus lib.* 2. calls them the *defenders of the holy table*, telling how the *Donatiſts* had broken through the roof of a Church, and had killed and wounded ſome of the Deacons, who preſerved the holy Elements from their ſacrilegious attempt.

The Deacõs diſtributed the Euchariſt, & ſometime they did give it to the Presbyters, but that was forbidden by the 18. *Can.* of the Council of *Nice*. Yet in the fourth Council of *Carthage*, *Can.* 38. *Diaconus, præſente Presbytero, Euchariſtiam corporis Chriſti populo ſi neceſſitas cogat, juſſus eroget.* *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem* in his 17. Catechiſm, counts the Deacon the Miniſter of Baptiſm, as well as the Biſhop or Presbyter. And certain it is, that generally Baptiſm was adminiſtred by the Deacons, as well as by the Presbyters.

Some parts of the publick Worſhip were alſo diſcharged by the Deacons. *Chryſoſtome hom.* 14. *ad Rom.* tells, that *the Deacons offered prayers for the people*; and *hom.* 17. *ad Heb.* he tells, *That the Deacons ſtood in a high place at the adminiſtration of the Euchariſt, and calling with a terrible voyce, as Heraulds, invited ſome, and rejected others from theſe holy myſteries.* And thus far I have given an account of the ſenſe which the Ancients had of the offices of Biſhop, Presbyter, and Deacon, which three were the only ones they accounted ſacred and divine. And this held good even at the time, that the *Areopagites* pretended Books were written (I call them pretended, becauſe there is none now ſo ſimple as to believe them his) for he reckons the Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy to conſiſt in theſe three degrees.

To this account given of Deacons, I ſhal add

ſomewhat of Deaconeſſes, of whom mention is made, *Rom.* 16. 1. where *Phebe* is called ἡ διάκονος, the *Deaconeſs of the Church of Cenchrea.* They are likewiſe ſo called in the 15. Canon of *Chalcedon*; but more ordinary in ancient writings διάκονισσαι. *Jerome* on that place to the *Romans*, ſpeaking of *Phebe*, underſtands her to have been a Deaconeſs: and adds, *Etiam nunc in Orientalibus Diaconiſſæ mulieres in ſuo ſexu miniſtrare videntur, in baptiſmo, ſive in miniſterio verbi, quia privatim docuiſſe fœminas invenimus ſicut Priſcillam.* He likewiſe underſtood the widows mentioned, 1. *Tim.* 5. to be Diaconeſſes: *Tales eligi voluit Diaconiſſas quæ omnibus eſſent exemplum vivendi.* *Origen* likewiſe takes it as undoubted, that *Phebe* had a particular office in the Church of *Cenchrea*: and ſaith on that place, *Hic locus Apoſtolica authoritate docet etiam fœminas in miniſterio Eccleſiæ conſtitui, in quo officio poſitam Phœben apud Eccleſiam quæ eſt Cenchreis.* *Chryſoſtome* likewiſe underſtood it to be an office: And ſaith on that place, καὶ τὸ ἀξίωμα προσέθηκε, διάκονον εἰπών. If any credit be due to the *Apoſtolical Conſtitutions*, they tell us many things of their office, though with a great alloy of much idle ſtuff. They tell, *That no woman might come to a Biſhop or Presbyter, except in the company of a Deaconeſs, Lib. 2. cap. 26. And that they were to go to womens houſes to inſtruct them, which had been ſcandalous for Church-men, Lib. 3. cap. 15. They did likewiſe receive them in Baptiſm, Cap. 16 And kept the gates by which women*

women entred into the Church, *Lib.* 8. *cap.* 28. So it seems their office was to instruct and teach women. And so *S. Paul*, *Phil.* 4. 3. speaks of *women who labored with him in the Gospel*. And *Rom.* 16. we find mention not only of *Priscilla*, but of *Tryphona, Tryphosa and Persis, who labored in the LORD*. And it is like their office was also to minister to the necessities of Church-men: and therefore when *S. Paul* speaks of *leading about a sister and a wife, as well as other Apostles*, he may be well understood to speak of one of those who might both have supplyed his wants, and assisted him in the conversion of women; but for eviting scandal, they were not to be under sixty years of age.

Mention is made of them by *Pliny*, *lib.* 10. *Epist.* 97. who writing to *Trajan*, of the enquiry he was making of the Christians, saith, *Necessarium credidi ex duabus ancillis quæ ministræ dicebantur quid esset veri & per tormenta quærere*. They were received by an ordination in *Tertullians* time: for he speaking of them, saith, (*De castit. cap.* 13.) *Ordinari in Ecclesia solent*. And *ad uxorem, lib.* 1. *cap.* 7. *Viduam allegi in ordinationem nisi univiram non concedit*. The 19. Canon of the Council of *Nice*, reckons the Deaconesses among those that were ἐν τῷ κανόνι, but saith that they had no imposition of hands, so that in all things they were reckoned among the Laicks; but hints that they had a particular

habit, calling them τῶν ἐν τῷ σχήματι ἐξεταζθεισῶν. *Balſamons* Gloſs on this is, that the Virgins who dedicated themſelves to GOD, continued in a Laical habit till they were forty years of age; and were then, if found worthy, ordained Deaconeſſes, by a particular impoſition of hands. To this *Zonaras* adds, that the Virgins in the twenty-fifth year of their age, got a particular habit from the Biſhop. The 74. Canon of *Nice*, according to the *Arabick* edition, appoints the office of the Deaconeſs to be only the receiving of women in Baptiſm. *Epiph. hareſ.* 79. after he hath proved that a woman is not capable of the publick ſervice of the Church, adds, that the order of the Deaconeſſes was inſtituted out of reverence to that ſex, that when the womans body was naked in Baptiſm, they might not be ſo ſeen by the Prieſt. And with this agrees the 12. Canon of the fourth Council of *Carthage: Viduæ vel ſanctimoniales quæ ad miniſterium baptizandarum mulierum eliguntur tam inſtructæ ſint ad officium, ut poſſint apto & ſano ſermone docere imperitas & ruſticas mulieres tempore quo baptizandæ ſint, qualiter baptizatori interrogatæ reſpondeant, & qualiter accepto baptiſmate vivant.* This is alſo confirmed by the 6. *chap.* of the 6. *Novel*, which appoints the age both for Virgins and Widows to be fifty years: *Sicque ſacram promereri ordinationem.* And their office is defined to be *adorandis miniſtrare baptiſmatibus*,

&

& alijs adeſſe ſecretis quæ in venerabilibus miniſterijs per eas rite aguntur. And the reſt of that chapter gives diverſe other rules concerning them.

The 15. Canon of *Chalcedon*, appoints a Deaconeſs not to be ordained till ſhe were forty years of age (it is χειροτονεῖσθαι in the Canon) and it is appointed that it be done after a ſtrict examination; but that after ſhe was ordained, and continued ſome time in the miniſtery, if ſhe gave her ſelf in marriage, ſhe (as one that had reproached the grace of GOD) was to be anathematized with her husband. *Zonaras* reconciles this age with the Apoſtle, that the Apoſtle ſpeaks of Widows, and this Canon of Virgins, though it be γυναῖκα in the Canon. Yet it ſeems ſome of theſe Deaconeſſes have given ſcandal in the Church, and perhaps proved like the females among the *Phariſees*, whom the *Rabbins* reckoned among theſe who deſtroyed the world: And ſo we find the Weſtern Church being ſcandalized at ſome miſcarriages in this Order, they are diſcharged to be ordained by the firſt Council of *Orange*, *Can.* 26. *Diaconiſſæ omninodo non ordinandæ, ſi quæ jam ſunt benedictioni quæ populo impenditur, capita ſubmittunt.* And in the beginning of the ſixth Century, it ſeems they gave great ſcandal; for Canon 22. Council *Epaun.* they are ſimply diſcharged: *Viduarum conſecrationem quas Diaconas vocant ab omni regione noſtra penitus*

abroganus, ſolam eis pœnitentiæ benedictionem ſi convertí ambiant imponendo. And *anno* 536. *Con. Aurel.* 2. *Can.* 17. *Benedictio Diaconatus*, is ſaid to be given to the women *contra interdicta Canonum*. And the next Canon of that Council is, *Placuit etiam ut nulli poſt modum fœminæ Diaconalis benedictio pro conditionis hujus fragilitate credatur*. Yet they are mentioned in the Council of *Worms* the year 868. Canon 73. where the 15. Canon of *Chalcedon* is wholly inſert. One ſcandal we find occaſioned by theſe Deaconeſſes, was, that they preſumed to diſtribute the elements in the Euchariſt; which *Gelaſius* blames in his ninth Epiſtle written to the Biſhops of *Lucania*, *Quod fœminæ ſacris altaribus miniſtrare ferantur*. And this it ſeems hath continued longer: For we find *Ratherius of Verona*, in the tenth Century, appoints in his Synodal Epiſtle (which in the Tomes of the Councils is printed as a ſermon of Pope *Leo* the fourths) *Nulla fœmina ad altare Domini accedat*. And *Matthæus Blaſtaris* in his *Syntagma*, *lit.* T. *cap.* 11. concludes it to be unknown what the office of the Deaconeſſes was. Some judged that they miniſtred to women, who being in age received Baptiſm, it being accounted a crime for a man to ſee a woman naked. Others thought that they might enter to the Altar, and exerciſe the office of Deacons, who proved this from many things, particularly from ſome words of *Nazianzens* Oration at his

ſiſters

ſiſters funeral, but that was afterwards forbidden διὰ τὴν τῶν ἐμμήνων ἀπροαίρετον φύσιν; yet he doubts much the truth of that, it not agreeing with reaſon, that women who were not ſuffered publickly to teach, ſhould be admitted to the office of a Deacon, whoſe duty it was by the miniſtery of the word, to purifie theſe who were to be baptized. And after that he gives an account of the form of their Ordination.

Mention likewiſe is made of them in the *Council in Trullo*, *Canon* 14. *a Deaconeſs was not to receive impoſition of hands, before ſhe was forty years of age.* Which is more expreſly appointed in the 40. Canon, where they decree, that though the Apoſtle made the age 60. yet the Canons had allowed their Ordination at 40. becauſe they found the Church was become firmer in the grace of GOD, and had advanced forward: and by the 48. Canon of that Council, a Biſhops wife, when ſeparated from her husband by conſent, was to live in a Monaſtery, & if found worthy might be made a Deaconeſs. *Baſil* by his 18. Canon allows virgins to be received at the ſixteenth or ſeventeenth year of their age, but by his 24. he reckons it a fault to receive a widow into the order under 60: yet it ſeems that was not peremptorly obſerved. For in his 44. Canon he ſpeaks of Deaconeſſes found in fornication, who might not be allowed to com-

communicat before ſeven years had been paſt in penitence. When this order failed in the *Greek* Church, we know not; but *Balſamon* on the 15. Canon of *Chalcedon* tells, That in his time Deaconeſſes were no more ordained, and his reaſon is becauſe no woman was ſuffered to enter unto the Altar, though (ſaith he) ſome women were abuſively ſo called.

As for the inferior degrees of *Subdeacon*, *Acolyth*, &c. as they were only *Juris Eccleſiaſtici*, ſo they were not deſigned for any ſacred performance, nor had they any holy character upon them: but were intended as ſteps for thoſe whom they were training up to ſacred employments, and were but like the degrees given in Univerſities. No mention is made of them in the firſt two Centuries: *Ignatius* is expreſs that there is no intermedial ſtep betwixt the Laick, and the Deacon, which ſtile we alſo meet in all the Fathers before *Cyprians* time.

He, epiſtle 24. ſpeaks of the *Lectors* and *Subdeacons*, telling how he had ordained *Saturus* a Lector, and *Optatus* a ſubdeacon, *quos jam communi conſilio Clero proximos feceramus.* And of the *Lectors*, he ſaith, epiſt. 34. *Cæterum Presbyterij honorem nos illis deſignaſſe ſciatis.* And by what follows, it is clear he means of a ſhare in the maintenance of the Church. Epiſtle 28. he ſpeaks of the *Subdeacons* & *Acolyths*, ſhewing how they likewiſe

likewiſe had a ſhare in the diviſions of the offerings made to the Church. Epiſtle 33. he tells of one *Aurelius*, who had been twice a confeſſor in the perſecution, whom he had ordained Lector, apologizing that he had done it without the conſent of his Clergy and people. *In ordinationibus ſolemus vos ante conſulere, & voces ac merita ſingulorum communi conſilio ponderare; ſed expectanda non ſunt teſtimonia humana, cum praecedant ſuffragia divina.* And after he hath laid out the merits of the perſon, he adds, *Placuit tamen ut ab officio Lectionis incipiat, quia & nihil magis congruit, voci quæ Dominum glorioſâ prædicatione confeſſa eſt, quam celebrandis divinis lectionibus perſonare.* Of the ſame ſtrain is his following epiſtle concerning *Celerinus*, who had refuſed to be ordained a Lector, until he was perſwaded to it by a divine revelation in the night. Likewiſe in his 76. epiſtle, he makes mention of *Exorciſts*: who are alſo mentioned by *Firmilian* in his epiſtle, which is reckoned the 75. among *Cyprians*. And at the ſame time *Cornelius*, the Biſhop of *Rome*, in his epiſtle (inſert by *Euſebius lib.* 6. *cap.* 43.) wherein he gives account of the Clergy were then at *Rome*; tells, That *there were* 46. *Presbyters*, 7. *Deacons*, 42. *Acolyths*, 50. *Exorciſts, Lectors, and Porters.* Theſe inferior Orders we ſee were then in the Church. And ſince we have no earlier accounts of them,

we

we may conclude their rise to have been about this time. A short account will suffice for their several employments, which will be best gathered from the several Canons of the 4. Council of *Carthage*.

Canon 5. *Subdiaconus quum ordinatur, quia manus impositionem non accipit, patinam de Episcopi manu accipiat vacuam, & calicem vacuum. De manu vero Archidiaconi urceolum cum aquâ, & mantile, & manutergium.* So his Office was to look to the vessels for the Eucharist, and to serve the Deacons in that work.

Canon 6. *Acolythus quum ordinatur ab Episcopo quidem doceatur, qualiter in officio suo agere debeat. Sed ab Archidiacono accipiat ceroferarium cum cereo ut sciat se ad accendenda Ecclesiæ luminaria manciparî, accipiat & urceolum vacuum, ad suggerendum vinum in Eucharistiam sanguinis Christi.* As for these *Cerei*, they shal be spoken of upon the next Canon. The work of *Acolythus* was to light the candles, and provide the wine: And from the *ratio nominis*, we may believe their office was particularly to wait upon the Bishop, and follow him.

Canon 8. *Lector quum ordinatur, faciat de alto verbum Episcopus ad plebem, indicans ejus fidem ac vitam, atque ingenium. Posthæc spectante plebe tradat ei codicem, de quo lecturus est, dicens ad eum: accipe, & esto lector verbi Dei, habiturus, si fideliter*

laer & utiliter impleveris officium, partem cum eis, qui verbum Dei ministraverunt. And by what hath been already cited out of *Cyprian* compared with this, it appears, that the Office of the *Lector* was judged that of the greatest importance of them all.

Canon 9. *Ostiarius quum ordinatur postquam ab Archidiacono instructus fuerit, qualiter in domo Dei debeat conversari, ad suggestionem Archidiaconi, tradat & Episcopus claves Ecclesiæ de altario, dicens: sic age, quasi redditurus Deo rationem pro his rebus, quæ his clavibus recluduntur.*

Canon 10. *Psalmista, id est, Cantor potest absque scientia Episcopi, solâ jussione Presbyteri, officium suscipere cantandi, dicente sibi Presbytero; vide, ut quod ore cantas, corde credas; & quod corde credis, operibus comprobes.* Now the *Psalmistæ* were these that were the singers, for it was appointed in the Council of *Laodicea*, that none might sing in the Church, εἰ μὴ οἱ περὶ τὸν ἄμβωνα, that is, those of the *suggestum*, or pulpit.

But because the 7. Canon will afford more matter of question, I have reserved it last. *Exorcista quum ordinatur, accipiat de manu Episcopi libellum, in quo scripti sunt Exorcismi, dicente sibi Episcopo: accipe, & commenda memoriæ, & habeto potestatem imponendi manum super Energumenum, sive baptizatum, sive Catechumenum.*

But for examining this of the *Exorcist*, we must

muſt run a little back. The *Jews* under the ſecond Temple were much addicted to Magick. In the *Talmud* it is given as a neceſſary qualification of one that might be of the *Sanhedrin*, that he ſhould be skilled in all Magical doctrins and charms. And in the inner-court of the Temple, called the *Court of Iſrael*, there was a chamber ſaid to have been built by one *Parva* a Magician, by the art of Magick, from whom it was called *Happarva*: And much of what they ſay of the *Bath-col*, ſeems to hint that it was an effect of Magick. Many places are alſo cited out of the *Talmud*, of their *Rabbies* killing one another by that art; and ſo highly do they extol it, that many of them thought that all miracles were wrought by the exact knowledge of the Cabbaliſtick arts, and it is well enough known how that abounded among the heathens. *Ulpian* made a law againſt theſe Phyſicians who cured diſeaſes by Exorciſms.

We ſee our LORD triumphed over the powers of darkneſs, who were then raging through the world: and that the Oracles were ſilenced at this time, is confeſſed by heathens. Neither did this gift of caſting out devils, conferred by our LORD on his Diſciples, die with them, but remain ſome ages in the Church.

Tertullian ſpeaks of it as a gift communicated to all Chriſtians. *De coronâ mil.* he tells, That ſome

ome ſouldiers did *exorciſmis fugare ſpiritus magnos*: and *de Idololatriâ, cap.* 11. *Quo ore Chriſtianus Thurarius* (this is one that offered incenſe to Idols) *ſi per templa tranſibit, fumantes aras deſpuet, & exſufflabit, quibus ipſe proſpexit: quâ conſtantiâ exorcizabit alumnos ſuos, quibus domum ſuam cellariam præſtat.* So that he hath underſtood this power of exorcizing to have been the effect of every ſincere Chriſtians prayer.

Origen in his 35. *tract.* on *Matth.* condemns the form of doing it, by adjuring the Devils, ſaying, that CHRIST hath given us power to command them: *Eſt enim Judaicum adjurare Dæmonia.*

Cyprian ſpeaks of an Exorciſm ordinarly preceeding Baptiſm; but prefers the vertue of Baptiſm to that of Exorciſm, *Epiſt.* 76. *Hodie etiam geritur, ut per Exorciſtas voce humanâ & poteſtate divinâ flagelletur, & uratur, & torqueatur Diabolus; & cum exire ſe & dimittere homines* DEI *ſæpe dicat: in eo tamen quod dixerit, fallat.* ..... *Cum tamen ad aquam ſalutarem, &c.* And *ad Demetrianum*, he ſaith, *O ſi audire eos velles, & videre, quando à nobis adjurantur & torquentur ſpiritalibus flagris, & verborum tormentis, de obſeſſis corporibus, ejiciuntur; quando ejulantes & gementes voce humanâ, & poteſtate divinâ flagella, & verbera ſentientes, venturum judicium confitentur.* And much of this nature is to be met with among the primitive

Wri-

Writers, which ſhews that the power of exorci-zing was an authority over Devils.

Yet if this had been a formal Office, reaſon will ſay it ſhould rather have been among the higheſt then loweſt Orders, the work being ſo great and miraculous. But from the *Areopagite*, and others, we are told, that before Baptiſm there was uſed a renunciation of the Devil, with a prayer for caſting him out: And there is ſome probability that theſe called *Exorciſts* were only *Catechiſts*, who had ſome formuls, whereby they taught, ſuch as they inſtructed, to renounce the Devil: and this with the prayer that accompanied it, was called an Exorciſm.

Nazianz. Orat. in Bapt. Ne exorciſmi medicinam aſperueris, nec ob illius prolixitatem animo concidas, nam velut lapis quidam Lydius eſt, ad quem exploratur, quam ſincero quiſque pectore ad baptiſmum accedat.

Cyril of *Jeruſalem*, *Præfat. in Catech. Feſtinent pedes tui ad catecheſes audiendas, exorciſmos ſtudioſe ſuſcipe, etiamſi exorcizatus & inſpiratus jam ſis, ſalubris enim eſt tibi reſiſta.* The Council of *Laodicea*, *Can.* 26. diſcharged all to *exorcize either in Churches or houſes, except theſe appointed for it by the Biſhops.* And by the tenth Canon of *Antioch*, the *Rural Biſhops* are warranted to conſtitute *Exorciſts*, from which we ſee they could not eſteem that a wonder working office. And

Balſa-

Balsamon in his *Sholion*, makes them one with the Catechists, ἐξορκιστὰς ἤτοι κατηχητὰς, and on the Canon of *Laodicea*, ἐξορκίζειν τοῦτο κατηχεῖν φησιν. And towards the end of his Gloss on that Canon, he saith, *That an Exorcist though appointed by the Chorepiscopus, and not by the Bishop,* καλῶς κατηχήσει. And *Beveridge* cites *Harmenopolus* to the same purpose on the tenth Canon of *Antioch*. From these evidences it is most probable to think, that the Exorcists at first were nothing but Catechists; but afterwards, as all things do in any tract of time degenerat, they became corrupt, beyond perhaps either these of the *Jews* or the *Gentils*; so that the Books of Exorcismes now in the *Roman* Church, are so full of Bombast terms, and odd receipts, that they are a stain to the Christian Church.

And it is the most prepostrous thing can be imagined, that what was given in the New Testament for the greatest confirmation of the Christian faith, should be made a constant Office, and put in so mean hands. And to this I need not add the base arts aud cheats discovered among that sort of people.

I shal conclud this long tedious account of the sense the Ancient Church had of the several Officers in it, with some words of *Tertullian*, which I shal barely set down, without any

deſcant on them, though they have occaſioned much perplexity to diverſe good Antiquaries. *Tertullian in exhortatione ad uxorem, cap. 7.* ſaith: *Nonne & laici Sacerdotes ſumus? Scriptum eſt regnum quoque nos & Sacerdotes DEO & Patri ſuo fecit. Differentiam inter Ordinem & plebem conſtituit Eccleſiæ authoritas, & honor per Ordinis conſeſſum ſanctificatus. Ideo ubi Eccleſiaſtici ordinis non eſt conſeſſus, & offers, & tingis & Sacerdos es tibi ſolus, ſed ubi tres ſunt, Eccleſia eſt, licet laici.* But others read theſe words differently, their copies having them thus: *Sanctificatus à DEO. Ubi Eccleſiaſtici ordinis eſt conſeſſus, & offert, & tinguit, Sacerdos qui eſt ibi ſolus: ſed ubi tres, Eccleſia eſt, licet laici.*

FINIS.